THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY E. G. SELWYN, D.D.

VOLUME XXV.

JULY—DECEMBER, 1932

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF
HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY A. C. SELWYN, D.D.

VOLUME XXV.
JULY—DECEMBER, 1932

London
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Dean of Winchester, The Deanery, Winchester, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXV JULY, 1932 No. 145

EDITORIAL

CONCERNING A CENTENARY

We indicated last month that the collocation on the cover of this Journal of the names of Newman and of Arnold—the two doughty opponents of a century ago—was significant. The same is true of the similar juxtaposition which meets the reader in the present issue; and the three names seem to us to form a fitting text for some observations on a certain centenary which is to be celebrated next year. These observations will not please all; perhaps they will not please many; but they may yet correspond with the unspoken thoughts of some. One observation is obvious: the Church of England could not have dispensed a century ago, and could not dispense now, with either of the two types of religion which these great personalities embodied. If we had to do without one of the two, it would be Newman: and indeed we did have to do without him, and survived it. But the face of England would be other than it is if Arnold had not lived. To read once more Stanley's *Life of Dr. Arnold* is to find the heart and conscience kindled again to a blaze by his fervent faith in God, his passion for righteousness, his singleness of purpose.

But that is not all. No less than Newman, Arnold was a great Churchman. His boyhood's letters show his love for the Church and its piety: its history was even then one of his absorbing interests: his pupils at Rugby became in after years some of its ablest leaders. What was this Church that could enlist the devotion of two such men whose ecclesiastical opinions were so utterly opposed?

The Oxford Movement was concerned primarily with the answer to that question. The answer of the Tractarians—as it had been that of the Caroline divines before them, and was to

be that of the *Lux Mundi* school later in the century—was that the Church of England was that part or branch of the Catholic Church which had been planted originally in this island, built upon the same Scriptures, professing the same faith, nourished on the same sacraments, and served by a ministry which derived by unbroken succession from the Apostles. Its charter was the Book of Common Prayer, which was then, and still is, the best witness to its Catholic claims. In its formularies there was nothing that was sectarian or merely individual, just as there was nothing that involved usurpation of the rights of conscience or extravagant pretensions to authority. The foundation principles of the Gospel—the reality of God, the priority of Revelation in all true thought of Him, the divine initiative in faith and prayer and sacrament, the divine foundation of the Church as an ordered Body—all those things that we mean, in short, by supernatural religion were part and parcel of the Prayer Book, and were made to live again not only with fresh power but also with a new coherence, by the leaders of the Oxford Movement. The whole body of the Church, which appeared in the early years of the century so lifeless, worldly, wooden, now took on a new meaning and was seen in its true nature as the Body of Christ. Much was due, in this transfiguration, to the Evangelical revival which had preceded it: more was due than is commonly recognized to hundreds of clergy who were doing their duty quietly in English villages in the eighteenth century: not a little was due to that very challenge from Liberalism which first brought Keble into the lists. But it was the Oxford Movement that first brought home to the Church of England as a whole the wealth of spiritual life of which it was the repository and the trustee.

It is well, then, that the centenary of such a movement should be celebrated. But it is well also that, in celebrating it, we should know what we are doing. The caution is needed, and on more sides than one. Consider first modern Anglo-Catholicism. The Anglo-Catholic Congress has naturally been early in the field: it probably originated the idea of next year's centenary; it has undoubtedly been forward with the organization of it. But, mask it as we may, Anglo-Catholicism today contains within itself two very different interpretations of the Church of England. On the one hand there are those who take their stand on the belief, which was the belief of the Tractarians, that the Church of England is and always has been the Catholic Church in this country. On the other, there are those who think that the Church of England is only partly Catholic, and has got to be made wholly so. The adherents of these several

schools may often work together for particular or partial ends: but in the long run the difference of their principles must end in a divergence of their paths. The first school rest on firm ground, for they have asked themselves, and have answered, the ultimate question, "Is the Church of England the Catholic Church in England or not?" To answer Yes to that question is to find an assured basis for spiritual life and work; to anchor the soul in a peace which reveals itself in such qualities as obedience and patience; and to let charity and contentment have their sovereign place. For such the ministry is primarily a ministry of teaching —teaching by eye as well as ear without doubt; in private as well as in public; of moral conduct no less than of faith, and of worship no less than of conduct. But it is teaching that builds always on those firm and agreed foundations to which the formularies of the Church of England bear witness.

But of the other element in the Catholic movement it is far more difficult to speak; for, having repudiated the authority of the Prayer Book, it rides uneasily at any anchor. It has enthusiasm, devotion, often success: but its liturgical eccentricities (amounting sometimes, as at Walsingham,* to downright superstition), its individualism, and its combativeness make it an awkward yoke-fellow in the Church's chariot. It lives not by teaching, but by propaganda; not by edifying, but by agitating. And for what does it agitate? To make the Church of England Catholic? That, perhaps, would be the commonest answer. But, if the Church of England is not already Catholic, how can agitation make it so? Still more, how can it be tolerable to remain in it for an hour? We are disposed to think, indeed, that the root of the malady lies in the fact that that question has been burked. That slow, critical quality which marks the English mind, its love of insular ways, its hiding of the spirit of devotion—these things are judged impatiently and without discrimination; and the reaction from them leads to a contempt for the Church of England, and to the search for a supposed Catholicism—neither Roman nor Anglican—which, in fact, has no existence.

It may be objected that this classification is too narrow and fails to cover the ground. Spiritual movements, it is urged, cannot always be tied down to formularies: they bring forth things new as well as old: they demand, and should be given, room for experiment, and in the process experiments which have

* The thanks of all Churchmen are due to the Rev. Dr. E. O. James for his trenchant exposé of the origins and tendencies of this cult.

proved useful across the water may well be tried also here. What if, in fact, the goal to which the Holy Ghost is leading the Anglo-Catholic movement today is a form of Catholicism neither Anglican nor Roman, but transcending both and destined to incorporate them into a larger synthesis? There is force in the argument: those who attended the first Congress in 1920 did indeed seem to catch a vision of a new God-given unity and fire of faith. But the plea must not be allowed more weight than it will sustain, nor be exploited to justify positions which are irrelevant to it. What was primary in the Congress of 1920 was the real intermingling of the spirit both of Evangelicalism and of Liberalism with the Catholicism which the Tractarians and their successors had vindicated. The fervour of that experience might justify a certain over-leaping of barriers between the Anglican and Roman Churches *in matters of method*; and both the Bishops and the Church-going public have been sympathetic in that regard. What it does not justify is the tendency to regard the barriers themselves as non-existent, and to settle down on Roman foundations and principles within the Church of England. To take only one example. Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament has come to be generally recognized as a frequent necessity of pastoral work under modern conditions; and its subsidiary reactions upon the devotional life of individuals are admitted, though less generally, to be both real and fruitful. Those are points of a kind calculated to make good on their own merits in the English Church. But nothing but harm is done if they are forced forward, sometimes on unwilling parishes, as part of a system borrowed *sans phrase* from the Roman Communion and defended on theological grounds which are frankly Romanesque.

So much for the first caution which the approach of the centenary seems to demand: the wholesomeness of the 1920 spirit needs to be guarded against those who would narrow it. But it may equally need to be guarded against those who would dilute it. That the Church as a whole should celebrate the centenary of the Oxford Movement is, no doubt, a thing much to be desired; and the Committee over which the Bishop of Salisbury presides has an indispensable work of co-ordination to perform. At the same time it is of great importance that the principles of the Catholic movement should not be overwhelmed and lost to view in a flood of popular emotion. There appears to be real danger that the mere prospect of "getting together" may be so pleasurable as to blur, if not to banish, the recollection of the purpose for which men are asked to

assemble. Now this group and now that is asking, Where do we come in? Evangelicals, both ancient and modern; Modernists, both moderate and extreme; the Westminster group, which gathers in its ample bosom all the pieties of all the parties; all these, together with the necessary sprinkling of ecclesiastical bigwigs, real and imaginary, are preparing to join in the great celebration. If we are not careful, the situation has all the makings of an ecclesiastical Tattoo. At least it is worth while to be forewarned. By all means, let all who will be invited to join in celebrating the centenary of the Oxford Movement. But let there be no doubt as to what is commemorated. It represents a set of principles which are deeply embedded in the formularies and the history of the Church of England, but which for all that are constantly challenged both from within and from without, and which demand today, no less than a century ago, the steadfast and often unpopular witness of those who believe in them.

We observed above that the great work of the Tractarians was the revival, throughout the English Church and on the basis of the Prayer Book, of supernatural religion. We have here the answer to the question propounded at the outset as to the nature of that Church which could enlist the devotion of two such diverse men as Dr. Newman and Dr. Arnold. For the truth is that the great common ground between them, on which both stood and for which both fought, was the reality of supernatural religion. They differed profoundly on many matters of doctrine and ecclesiastical practice, but on the foundation principles of faith in God and in Providence, of the Incarnation, of Sin and Judgment, of the supremacy of conscience, they were agreed. And the whole genius of the Church of England might be said to be symbolized alike in the agreement and in the controversy between the Tractarians and Arnold. It was controversy between men who accepted the essentials of the Catholic faith and took their stand on the revelations contained in Holy Scripture. Each witnessed to great aspects of the truth; and neither testimony can the Church afford to lose.

Special interest attaches in this regard to Miss Ruth Kenyon's articles on the Social Teaching of the Tractarians; for they go far to exemplify the cause of Arnold's estrangement, and to show it to have been political and temperamental rather than theological or religious. The High Toryism of Pusey was of all political doctrines most repugnant to Arnold's mind; while the submission taught by Keble, though it did not prevent a close personal friendship between Keble and Arnold, was yet wholly

alien to its strong passion for practical reform. And it is significant that Arnold, no less than Pusey—and, we may add, no less than Gore—derived his zeal for reform from the study of the Hebrew prophets. In their attitude to the State also there was strong affinity between Pusey and Arnold: neither was prepared to tolerate the notion of a secular State, though their notions of how this danger should be forestalled were wholly at variance.

But what would either of them have said to the kind of social problems that press upon mankind today? The question is suggested by a sermon by the Bishop of Birmingham published in the May number of *The Modern Churchman* under the title of "The Religious Situation." In this sermon Dr. Barnes claims to be "in the tradition of which" Dr. Arnold "was an ornament." Some of the points he mentions in illustration of this claim are justifiable enough: but others, and in particular the marked Pelagian temper which runs through the utterance, show the Modernist of today to be of a very different spirit from the great Liberal of a century ago. Arnold could surely not have been so forgetful of the Gospels as to write of "abnormal human beings" (*i.e.*, the mentally deficient) that "they are not fit material for the Kingdom of God: of mud you cannot build a palace." Contrast that utterance with Christ's attitude to epileptics, paralytics, and demoniacs—all of them "abnormal human beings"—and you have the measure of the *ethical* difference between Catholicism and Modernism.

Nevertheless, the problem on which Dr. Barnes here touches is an exceedingly grave one—far more so, indeed, than he implies. "Can one," he asks, "who accepts the religious teaching of Jesus the Christ and reveres alike His example and His authority, say that the modern world is rushing headlong to social and spiritual destruction? I doubt it." Yet this is exactly what is being said, not merely by moralists, Christian or other, but by a growing number of men of acknowledged scientific authority. The Rev. S. A. McDowall's book, *Biology and Mankind*, is symptomatic of this attitude, and focusses the problem with admirable lucidity. What we are witnessing today is the reversal of the Law of Natural Selection; with the result that civilization is tending to the survival, not of the fit, but of the unfit. The best stocks, that is to say, are being less and less prolific: the stocks which are physically and mentally of low grade are increasing, both absolutely and in proportion to the rest. Civilization has reached a point where its progress has become dys-genic, and where the prospect, not of a

gradual but of a rapid, deterioration of the human species is now in sight. And that is the gravest social problem confronting mankind today.

What is, or should be, the Church's reaction to it? Men of science are foremost in urging that the Church's attitude is of great importance: its close contact with every section of society, and with those instinctive and emotional springs of action which play so great a part in human affairs, gives to the Church, for better or worse, a far-reaching influence. The biologists advocate a twofold policy. On the one hand, they wish to stem the propagation of mental defect, which appears to be unquestionably heritable, by legalizing voluntary sterilization under proper safeguards. Given adequate safeguards, we know of no antecedent theological objection to such a course. Catholic tradition has permitted the opinion that our Lord's words in St. Matthew xix. 12 could be taken literally, and until recently the Roman Church gave a privileged position to those who did so; and the far less drastic course contemplated by modern reformers could fairly claim to be adopted "for the kingdom of heaven's sake." But it is easy to exaggerate the beneficial effects of such a policy: it could be no more than a palliative. Of much greater importance is the positive policy of encouraging fertility in the healthy stocks. This is partly an economic question, not least of the economics of education and of equitable taxation. But it is also, as the Church knows well, a moral and spiritual question. The procreation of children as one of the primary ends of marriage cannot be too insistently taught; nor is the grace of God more needed, or better demonstrated, in anything than in the cheerful acceptance of the burdens and cares of a family.

Yet, even so, there remains a real problem. For the fact must be faced that the reaction of Christianity on the world is bound to be in part anti-biological. No one proclaimed this more clearly than T. H. Huxley, whose *Evolution and Ethics* begins with showing how the process of nature and the process of civilization cut across one another. Christianity has undoubtedly brought into the world a new sensitiveness to suffering; and in its conflict with famine, pestilence, war, and infant mortality, it is unquestionably promoting the survival of many whom nature, left to itself, would pronounce unfit. Its very charity, that is to say, appears to be accentuating the menace to mankind. It is a problem which may well exercise thoughtful minds, if indeed it does not fill them with despair of a solution. We certainly cannot suggest one here; but we

will mention one point which must be remembered, before we conclude. It is this. There is nothing in the teaching of Christ or His Apostles which gives warrant for supposing that the goal of mankind is a perfect society on this earth. In seeking to curtail the propagation of mental defects and to increase the fertility of healthy stocks, the Church is not animated by any phantasmagorical hopes of an earthly paradise. In flat opposition to Dr. Barnes, it asserts that there is a place for the mental defective in the Kingdom of God. But on the other hand, the Christian conscience cannot but be alive to the loss and misery and waste which mental deficiency involves. It is bound to seek the prevention of preventible evils, even though other evils remain. Yet its own distinctive witness will always be to another kingdom than that of this world. The problem before us, in short, is not less urgent than that which confronted the Church in the fourth century. It is the problem of the relation of the *civitas terrena* to the *Civitas Dei*. There is room for another Augustine to illuminate it.

SOME LETTERS OF DR. ARNOLD

VI

To Mrs. Delafield,
Slatwoods,
Cowes,
Isle of Wight.

College,
March 29th., 1809.

Dear Aunt,

I fear I have been unusually tardy in answering your last letter, but it is at present Easter Time, and our Business is harder now, than any done by any Part, at any Time in the School, which I believe will be pretty apparent, when you read an Account of it.—In the Morning we write out sixty Sentences out of Huntingford's Greek Exercises, with the Themes Declensions and Conjugations of each Word, besides saying by Heart about ten Leaves of Greek Grammar. In the Afternoon we do about three Pages of Trapp's Lectures on Poetry, and abridge 40 Pages of Adam's Roman Antiquities into six in a Copy Book: we have besides a Prose Task, a Metre Task, and a Long Verse to do every Week. I have been therefore so much employ'd that I know not when I should have written had I not had a very severe Earache Sunday Night, for which I went continent Monday Morning, & intend to stay as long as I possibly can, as it is a great Pleasure to get off any of our Easter Business. All yesterday I was as well as possible: but was awoke about four o'clock this Morning (Tuesday) with violent Pain in my other Ear, which continued till about eight, when it went away, & I am now very comfortably sitting at Sick House, with five other Fellows about as ill as I am. You see there is a great Deal of Deception carried on here if it may be called so, for I believe the Masters are perfectly well acquainted with the whole State of the Case. I have been playing Quoits & Cricket all Day, & being now pretty well tired, I sit down to rest myself by writing to you: I am much amused with the Debates in the House about the Duke of York, and as I can write with rather more Temper than I generally talk with, I will tell you what I think of the Subject as far as I am able to comprehend it, for I confess I understand it very imperfectly, & will therefore avoid giving any decided opinion on it.—I think that there is a great Cry in the Opposition about Patriotism & the Constitution of the Country which has very little Meaning:—

Those Terms have been so hacknied that they are little better than empty Declamation—on the other Hand I think the Ministry go too far in Defence of the Duke, when they say they see no fault in his Conduct.—What ? no Fault ? Is then the permitting a Mistress to intermeddle at all in military Affairs no Fault ? I do not suppose that he has himself been bribed, but surely he cannot be ignorant that Mrs. Clarke has, & if he is not, how guilty is his Conduct.—But Ministers seem determined to protect him, & will I fear succeed in effectually hindering further Investigation.—Far be it from me to wish a Prince of the Blood Royal of England to suffer any thing which may hurt his Feelings or his Character, but surely there is a Duty due to the People as well as to him; and at the present Moment, when Resistance to the Power of Bonaparte by Land is for ever [crush]'d, I think the British Commander ought to [?] from Suspicion of Guilt—His Character ought to be [. ?]. So much for Politics—I will now relate an Event that interests me more nearly.—Farewell all my golden Dreams of a long Stay at Sick House—I write this in School on Wednesday Evening—the whole Process of this dire Catastrophe I will relate at large.—Yesterday Morning, why or wherefore I know not, the Apothecary was sent for, and finding all his Patients in perfect good Health (there not being one, to whom he could have the least Pretence to give a Black Dose, which usually pays him for his Walk) he was highly incensed at his unprofitable Waste of Breath Labour & Time, & accordingly told Goddard the State of the Case.—Whereupon the Præfect of Hall expell'd me and sundry others abroad last night: But I this Morning sent over to him again & obtain'd his Permission to stay continent to Day—Oh vain Precaution.—Some unlucky Dæmon made four fresh Fellows come to Sick House to Day, so that the List no sooner met Goddard's Eye, than incens'd at the extravagant Number (for there were no less than nine) he sent his trusty Deputy the Præfect of Hall to bring all who were not seriously ill into School.—Accordingly myself, Blackstone, Wall, & another Fellow, accompanied by all the other Fellows at Sick House, exulting over our Distress, went up to School: Senior Part the fifth were up to Books, so that I & Blackstone had the Satisfaction to have a long Lecture from Goddard about shurking continent. This Evening we have been set on, & I having no Band have got to do some English Verse on Orpheus & Eurydice. —We shall never hear the End of it, & Lipscomb not being able to say his Greek Grammar this Morning shares our Fate in everlasting *Jaw* (If I may use so vulgar an Expression)—I ask you if this is not a most deplorable Catastrophe—I am heartily sick of it—To day he mischievously asked me & Blackstone what

Verses we had made at Sick House. In short we shall be exposed to his Sarcastic Remarks for this long Time, & what is worse, very probably shall not get leave again.—I have been reading nothing new lately, except Xenophon's Romance the Cyropædia, in which under the Character of Cyrus he [? paints] a Model for a good King.—The Dialogues are very lively & amusing, the Characters natural and diversified, the Advice very good, & the Morality extremely pure: there are likewise some very good Military Præcepts: for Xenophon did not, like some Writers, talk of Wars, Politics &c. sitting in the Obscurity of a Closet.—No ! he was himself a General & Statesman inferior to none of his Age. I think if you could get the Book in English you would like it much: I heard to Day we have lost a Frigate: if so I think it is a very bad Thing.—I have nothing more to say so will conclude by assuring you that I remain your most dutiful & sincerely attach'd Nephew

T. ARNOLD.

P.S.—I return you my sincere Thanks for the Fowls, the Apples & the Money, especially for the Apples, as they are particularly suited for Presents.—I am very much oblig'd to Fan for her Note and also to my dear Mother for her kind Letter. Goodbye & the sooner you write the better. I hope you will be able to make it out.—T. ARNOLD.

VII

TO MRS. DELAFIELD,
SLATWOODS,
COWES,
ISLE OF WIGHT.

COLLEGE,
April 22nd., 1809.

DEAR AUNT,

I have waited long in Expectation of a Letter from Slatwoods but having been disappointed, I am determined to show you that I am not angry by writing again to you—And I believe you will find this sheet not totally destitute of Intelligence. The public Spirit of the Gentlemen in first Chamber, surprised us all last week by the announcing a *Play* to be perform'd on Saturday Night by the Fellows in the Chamber—Tickets were sent out to several Fellows & to me amongst the Number, so that I was an Eye-witness of the whole Transaction, which I think will be found productive of some Entertainment.—April 26th. I have been so idle that I waited till to Day before I should begin to write, & as I have received Frances' Letter this Morning I shall proceed with my Narration.—The Play was the "Daring Brigand" made for the Occasion; the Fable of which I

shall explain as I proceed: The Stage was compos'd of Chests cover'd with the Rugs from the Beds, & in Front with some richly-embroider'd Cloth for a good Effect. Now in every Chamber there is a Post in the middle, which whether intended as a Support to the Ceiling, or for any other Purpose, was extremely serviceable on the present Occasion.—This being in a direct Line with the Fireplace, a Piece of String was fasten'd from this to the Sconce over the Grate, at a convenient Height, and on this other Rugs were hung which were not pull'd up like the Curtain in the Theatre, but obliquely like those to a Bed from Side to Side. This veil'd the Front; and Curtains being in like Manner extended from the Post to the other Part of the Room, an Angle of the Chamber was thus allotted for the Representation. At the back of the Stage there were other Curtains about a yard from the Wall, which was the Place for the Actors to retire to, when not on the Stage. The Præfects had their Seats on two Forms in Front; the Inferiors sat on the Tops of Beds & other elevated Situations behind.—I & one or two more sat on the Ground in Front of the Præfects & had thus as good a View as possible. I am afraid I have not after all my Accuracy given you a good Idea of the Arrangement of our little Theatre: but this I can justly say, the Plan was admirably suited to the Convenience of every one, & every Thing was conducted with the utmost Order & Regularity.—When the Curtain was drawn, the Captain of the Robbers first made his Appearance, solus—The Dress I shall describe as well as I can: On his Head he wore a black Cap, set with *Glass Diamonds* & adorn'd with a lofty & elegant Feather: His Face was blackened on the Eyebrows, & Beard, & in his Belt were stuck two immense Horse Pistols; he had an immense Broad Sword (a real one) by his Side, & over the rest of his Dress, was thrown a beautiful Plaid Cloak. He then spoke a few Words of his Intention to go privately to the Doge of Venice's Palace & in the Disguise of a Friar officiate at the Marriage of Count Alberti with the Doge's Daughter Rosalia: In the midst of the Ceremony he was to stab Alberti with a conceal'd Dagger, & then assisted by his Robbers, whom a Whistle should summon to his assistance, & favour'd by the Confusion of the Palace, he was to carry off the beautiful Rosalia to his Cave in the Forest—After having acquainted his Followers, (who had nothing remarkable in their Dress) with his Design, he makes his exit; & the following Scene discovers the Palace of the Doge: He enters in Conversation with Count Alberti, both of their Dresses I shall describe.—The Doge was powder'd, had a very large Paunch, large Buckles in his Shoes, & his whole Appearance very superb: more especially he had a very beautiful Robe of crimson Velvet, over the rest of his

Dress.—Alberti was likewise powder'd, and adorn'd with a huge Broad Sword:—He expresses his Wish to go in Search of the Robber who has committed such Depredations in the City, which the Doge refuses to grant, & says that his Daughter would be inconsolable for his Loss—He also says that the Nuptials shall be consummated immediately.—Rosalia is then introduced who was represented by a Fellow of very elegant Figure, which was the chief Thing requisite: He or she was dress'd in a beautiful white Gown very finely worked with a handsome Broach on the Breast; an elegant Turban [covered her] Head & a Shawl negligently thrown over her Shoulders. Her [voice] was soft & pleasing, & so gracefully she conducted herself, that it required but a small Effort of the Imagination to fancy her a real Woman. When they were kneeling at the Ceremony, the treacherous Friar stabs Alberti who falls, & the Robbers immediately entering, he secures & carries off Rosalia.—She is next introduced in the Cave bewailing her Distress & rejecting the passionate Sollicitations of her rude Lover, who understanding that Alberti was not mortally wounded, forms the desperate Plan, of returning to the Palace to finish the bloody Tragedy.—He accordingly enters Alberti's Apartment, & a furious Combat ensues between them with their Broadswords; at last Alberti wounds his Antagonist, who finds Means to retreat to his Cave, & in the next Scene is discover'd dying surrounded by his Associates; he now sollicits the Forgiveness of Rosalia, and is scarcely fairly dead, & laid out on the Stage when Alberti enters at the Head of a Body of Guards, & attacks the Robbers: The Play directed them to take the Robbers quietly Prisoners, & the Doge was to have made a concluding Speech on the Marriage of the Count & his Daughter: but instead of this the Guards made their onset with trusty Clubs, & with such Fury, that the Robbers were oblig'd to fight in their own Defence.—In the mean Time the Lady got into a Corner, & the Stage exhibited for a few Moments a Scene of most extravagant Confusion.—But the Combatants unluckily forgot in the midst of their engagement, the Chief of the Robbers who was laying as I before mention'd dead upon the Stage: They therefore bestowed so many Kicks on the Carcase of the batter'd Chief that unable longer to endure his Situation he rose from the dead, & by one effort, clear'd the Stage of the whole Posse, by hurling them thro' the Curtain into the midst of the Chamber. Thus was the Play curtail'd, & much injured by the Fury of the Guards, & the too acute Sensibility of the dead: I have now written so much about this one Subject that I have very little Room left for any Thing else, but as it is a true & exact account of a Scene that afforded me much Entertainment, I thought it would

not be displeasing: and as they will be continued I believe every Saturday night, I will give you an Account of them all if they deserve Notice.—Cloister Time is begun, and all my Fatigues of this Half-Year ended—I have begun for employment & Relaxation, to read Gibbon's famous Decline & Fall of the Roman Empire, & after that Hume's History of England:—I think I shall have Need of all my Orthodoxy, to support me in the perusal of Writers, who conceal their Hatred to Christianity behind a Veil of feign'd Respect, and who, while they avoid shocking the Feelings of the pious by the open Language of Infidelity, imperceptibly steal away our Consent to their Doctrines by Sneers of the most refin'd Irony & by wilfully confounding, as is often done, the Purity of Religion, with the Vices & Follies of its Ministers.—It must be confess'd indeed that the gross Imposition, nefarious Forgeries, & worldly Conduct of the Christian Bishops, with their malevolent & Bigotted Invectives against the most exalted Characters of the Heathen World afford ample Room for Censure & Satire—but why should Religion, as I said before, be reproach'd for the Vices of its Ministers.—I was heartily amus'd by Fan's Description of the Dress & Persons of your antiquated Visitors the Rowlands. From what Place upon Earth could my Mother obtain such Acquaintances? I should have imagined that they could not have stirr'd out in so eccentric a Dress without attracting the Notice of the Mob.—In answer to your enquiry concerning Corpus . . . Bartholomew & Short both stood as Candidates but unfortunately another Wreath was gain'd by Eaton: & Coldridge was elected: But this was owing entirely to the Superiority of his own Genius: & the Electors asserted, that they never remembered one who had passed so good an Examination as Bartholomew, & yet had not succeeded.—I am again Continent: but being taught by Experience, I consented to have some Draughts which, contrary to my Expectation, the pleasantest I ever tasted:—They entirely remov'd my Complaint which was of no very serious Nature.—I had the other Evening a most delightful mess: I bought & boil'd four Pints of Milk into which I pour'd four eggs beat up nicely, & then eat it with Sugar—There were two of us, but we could not finish more than half of it. I will now conclude & believe me to remain your most affectionate Nephew,

T. Arnold.

Give my Love to all my Friends, & tell Olive I will do her Errand if possible.—Farewell.

VIII

To Mrs. Delafield,
Slatwoods,
Cowes,
Isle of Wight.

College,
June 7th., 1809.

Dear Aunt,

I received Lydia's Letter this morning, and as you express'd a Wish to hear from me on Friday or Saturday, I think I cannot do better than do even more than I was asked & answer it by Return of Post. In Answer to your kind Offer of a Cake or half a Guinea I prefer the former, and would feel much obliged to you if you ask one of my Sisters, (Frances I dare say will have no Objection) to add a few lines to be enclos'd in the same Parcel; if however this Request is troublesome, do not grant it. I felt sorry & asham'd to have written so short a Letter as my last, but I really had nothing to say & besides I was in a hurry to send it off: but however I will try to make amends for it by the Length of this: On the Morning of the twenty ninth of May the Anniversary of the Restoration, & the still greater event of the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, our Chamber sustained a most dreadful Siege for nearly two Hours without Intermission, from about thirty Fellows. I will relate the Particulars of this most memorable Action at full Length; and if the Perusal of it gives you as much Pleasure as the Acting did me, I shall think myself amply rewarded: You must know it is the Custom at this Time of the Year for many Boys to get up two or three Hours before the rest, some for the Purpose of learning lines against the End of the half year, others chiefly Præfects to learn their Election Business, & a number at least as numerous as either of the former, get up for the Purpose of making a noise, & disturbing the Sleep of others. Two Fellows in our Chamber got up, & I waking a little Time after & getting out of Bed, thought proper to relock our Door, which had been opened to let out the Boys I mention'd; as I thought it not unlikely that we should be visited.—And I think it very lucky I did so, as otherwise we should have been every one of us pull'd out of Bed. The noisy Multitude out in Court, had already made great Havock in two other Chambers, when finding our Door lock'd, they had Recourse to Stratagem; & sent one of those who had got up out of our own Chamber to the Window, to ask us to open the Door, under Pretence of getting out a Book: In Case this had succeeded, they all intended to rush in.—But we were too cunning for them, so having tried the same Stratagem twice without Effect, they commenc'd the attack in Form. Now the Beds are dispos'd in Order all round the

Chamber, & mine was close on one Side of the Window, the Head of it being plac'd against the Wall in which the Window is, & as there is over it a Head very much resembling that of the little turn up Bed I used to sleep in, I was very secure; moreover my Bookcase and Desk, or as it is call'd Wiccamice Toys were on the Side of me as a further Shelter, so I defied their Efforts. But they deliberately breaking a Pane of Glass opened the Window entirely & rain'd in a most dreadful shower of Trenchers Bread, Water &c., which horrible Din woke us all, & we immediately began to Concert Measures for our Defence.—On the Top of my Bed I keep my Shoes & washing Box with various other Articles, and as I was thrusting my Nose out of Bed to learn the Cause of such an Uproar, one of the Enemy putting a long Stick thro' the Window, push'd every Thing down on my Head. I was so much annoy'd at this, that I immediately drew my Feet up into the Bed out of the Reach of the Shot, as several pieces of Glass had fallen around me.—In the mean Time one of our Men got up on the Top of a Bed on the other Side of the Window, in such a Situation, that without being touch'd himself, he could annoy anyone who came near the Window: Here he stood arm'd with Cups of Beer, which he pour'd very liberally on all who came near him, to the great Discomfiture of the hostile Squadrons.—But another of our Men coming out in his Shirt to the Scene of Action, & not being sufficiently cautious, received such a Wound in his Posteriors from a Stone, that he fled howling to his Bed:—In the meanwhile it was first Peal, that is, the Time when the Boys begin to get up, though they do not go into Chapel till an Hour afterwards: at this Time therefore, the Efforts of the Enemy relaxing, our Junior, who was one of the Besiegers came in & fill'd with great Difficulty two Basons of Water, one of which I took, as the Præfects went out to Conduit; But the Siege continuing, the Supplies of Water were cut off so as to preclude all the other Fellows from washing. At this Time we had not above four Men engag'd whereas the Enemy had nearly twenty, who now began attacking us with Squirts which they directed thro' the Window, & thro' some Holes in the Door, so as to scour the whole Chamber. This new Mode of Attack perplex'd us greatly as we did not know how to oppose it effectually, and I had Reason to hate it; for as I was standing near the Door, which had been hitherto unmolested, Lipscomb, who was among the Besiegers, gave me the whole Contents of his Instrument in my Face.—At last our indefatigable Defender who had never deserted his Window Situation, being arm'd with a Bason full of the Water in which I had been washing, observed one of the Enemy advance within

Reach of his Weapon: he accordingly discharg'd the whole on his Head, which caus'd him great Annoyance, the Soapy Particles mixing with his Hair, & the sable Streams flowing down his Countenance: Another also having received the same Salutation, the Efforts of the Besiegers gradually relax'd, & in a few Minutes rais'd the Siege to our great Relief, leaving the Window Seat, & all the Vicinity completely drench'd in Water.—So ended this most memorable Siege, which has been spun out, to what, I fear, you will call an unconscionable Length; but however I have not yet concluded my Letter, I will try to find something else.—Our Chamber is I believe very subject to Sieges: for I was myself besieg'd in my Bed, by about six Fellows the other night: The Cause of which was my getting into Bed before the other Fellows, where I was assaulted by two or three at first; but Lipscomb coming into the Chamber & beginning the Assault, & the Forces of the Enemy increasing, I sprung out of Bed, & girding a Blanket about me, & standing up on my Bed gave & sustain'd a most dreadful Fire.—Loaves of Crum of Bread, Washing Boxes, Candles, Candle Sticks, the Broom & every Kind of missile Weapon was hurl'd without Distinction: I received a Wound on my Head from a washing Box, but my Pericranium being far harder than any Stone, the Washing Box rebounded; The only Damage I sustain'd was in my Bed, which was not only pull'd to Pieces entirely, but so covered with Crumbs, Candles &c, that I was oblig'd to make it again completely.—This Morning as we were going to Hills we pass'd or rather accompanied Eight hundred Soldiers who were all going to the River to bathe; At one Place we had to cut through them all, & as both kept advancing, the Hustling was in Consequence great: When they came to the River, I never in my Life saw such a Sight: They all stripp'd & danc'd about the Banks, some jump'd in, all raising the most horrible Cries, as you must know it rain'd the whole Time, & the Wind was very fresh.—I suppose it was done to make them hardy:—Since I read Gibbon, I have read Russel's Modern Europe, & Memoirs of the Duke of Berwick written by himself: Both are I think very entertaining. You know that the Duke of Berwick was a natural Son of James the second, & at the Revolution went abroad & was made a Marshal in the French Service, in which he distinguish'd himself very much:—He defeated the English Dutch & Portuguese at the fatal Battle of Almanza; & was kill'd at the Siege of Philipsburg. —You talk about White Waistcoats: You know it is impossible to wear white waistcoats every Day in the Morning: Besides I have none to go home in, as I cannot wear a thick Winter Waistcoat in the middle of Summer. I would therefore thank you to let me have a coloured linen Waistcoat made here, which

will serve me for the Mornings at Home: I am very sorry for the Fruit: I hope the Gooseberries & Currants will not share the Fate of the Cherries: I hope I shall see my Cousin in the Holydays, as from the short Time I saw him, I like him uncommonly: I intended to send this Yesterday but could not find Time & as I have nothing more to say, I will conclude, with assuring you that I remain your most dutiful & affectionate Nephew,

T. ARNOLD.

TRADITION AND PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

AT the present time tradition is having a poor lookout. We are being assured that people—especially the young—pay little or no regard to its authority in either religion or morals. Tradition is a voice from the past, and the young are always, while living in the present, looking hopefully to the future. Besides, they are introspective and self-reliant and claim a freedom of thought and action which would not have been conceded a generation ago. What has led to this change of attitude is not easy to determine; but it exists, and its significance for thought and life demands anxious consideration. Whatever the cause, there is revolt. Authority as such has lost much of its power. It implies external pressure, and in matters of thought and feeling this is what people will not admit. It must have the sanction of their own judgment and pass the test of their own experience of life.

This attitude seems reasonable. We are free to think and to decide and the mere possession of this liberty is a claim to its exercise. To fail to use it is to shirk our responsibility as reasoning beings with a power of initiative and of response—not mere machines, running in a groove. For the appeal of religion is to the ego, to the whole personality. We, each for ourselves, have to make our own choice. God Himself, the source and centre of all authority, will not compel our submission. He leaves us free, as He, who made us in His own image, is free. It is this ultimate fact of our position before God that gives weight to the conviction that any choice presented to us as a course of belief or action must be considered in relation to our own experience. It must stand before the bar of our own conscience as to what is right or wrong. The external voice of authority must find adhesion within if it is to be acknowledged as a guide of life and conduct.

The full recognition of this truth is a matter of quite recent origin; and, like other new arrivals, it has been seized upon and

exploited to an undue extent, so much so that, with many, the principle of external authority has been flouted and a false antithesis set up between the claims of authority on the one hand and the rights of personal experience on the other.* It is as though we had to choose between them and, if guided by the sanction of an external authority, we were, *ipso facto*, depriving ourselves of the right of private judgment.

The authority of the Christian Religion rests to a large extent upon tradition. The words and acts of Christ which form the staple of its contents have passed from one to another before they took a fixed form in the Gospels. They reach us through tradition. They claim our acceptance on the ground that they proceed from men who were in a position to know the truth of what they report; for their knowledge of our Lord was personal and intimate.†

But does this personal factor ensure that what has been handed down is trustworthy? Speaking generally, much of our knowledge of the past comes to us through tradition. Very often a considerable interval has elapsed between the event and its committal to writing; and we have to allow, not only for imperfect habits of observation at the time of the occurrence, but for failure of memory and for possible prejudice. We must not conclude that the report of a saying or an action that appeals to life and conduct has been made with the dispassionate temper of a scientist, who notes the result of an experiment. Enthusiasm on the one hand and prejudice on the other are apt, unconsciously, to warp the judgment. Mistakes arise which are not easily corrected. We cannot cross-examine our witnesses. In the absence of direct proof, we require a criterion of which the validity would be acknowledged when applied to other cases besides the one in question. In fact, our estimate of the value of a tradition is largely a matter of psychology.

Now, psychology, in its present stage, is far from being an exact science. Its application is a process of extreme delicacy. We cannot say with certainty that what affects one mind in a certain way will have the same influence on another. Yet, because as in so many things probability is the guide of life, we are justified in bringing our general conception of the mentality of ordinary people to bear upon our estimate of the trust-

* *Vide* A. E. Taylor, *The Faith of a Moralist*, 1930, ii., p. 213. "Authority and experience do not stand over against one another in sharp and irreconcilable opposition; authority is the self-assertion of the reality of an experience which contains more than any individual experient has succeeded in analyzing out and extricating for himself." *Cf. ibid.*, pp. 241, 242.

† *Vide* Burney, *The Poetry of Our Lord*, p. 6, on the rhythm of the Lord's Prayer as guaranteeing our knowledge of actual words of Christ.

worthiness of a tradition. And although we cannot say that what seems an unlikely tradition is certainly untrue to fact, we *can* affirm that one which does not flagrantly contravene the ordinary standards of likelihood and has had the adhesion of sensible people is worthy of our acceptance *from the mere fact of its existence as a tradition.*

For stories that deal with actual fact do not suddenly spring out of the ground. They have their antecedents in some nexus of events, a past experience, which must be posited as effectual causes of the tradition. They have a background.

No doubt the possibility of motive has to be considered. There are cases of pure invention or of self-interest or the mere desire to startle. Here the conditions in which the story was started must be inquired into. Again, in testing the character of a tradition, a distinction must be made between what is a colourless narrative of an ordinary occurrence and what, by its mere recital, will divide men into opposing groups from the fact that, if true, the story has an appeal to life and conduct.

Tradition is in close connection with history. It furnishes much of its material. It is history in the making. It has not attained finality. It must, therefore, be used with caution. We are familiar with the way it has of gathering round the persons of men who loom large in history. On the strength of a general knowledge of their character and disposition, what it is thought likely they will say or do is ascribed to them on hearsay, or—as often happens—by transference from the performances of other people. The first duty of the historian is to clear his subject of baseless assertions which only hide the real man from view, or, in a narrative, to free the actual event from the embellishments with which a loose tradition has obscured its salient features.

It frequently happens that history is wholly dependent on tradition. Where written documents are lacking, or where there are blanks in a chain of evidence, the known prevalence of a tradition is to be seriously taken into account.

But we have to be on our guard. If unwritten, its edges are often ill-defined. It varies as it passes from mouth to mouth. It depends on memory, and the more advanced the civilization in which it circulates, the more it breathes in a literary atmosphere, the less likely is memory to retain it in an accurate form. It is in the life of the desert, among primitive races, that it best maintains its original contact with reality. History based on such a foundation, or at least including it in its sources, is justified in its trust.

It is hardly realised how large a part has been played by tradition in accepted history. A good example of the process is

the material of St. Matthew i., ii. and St. Luke i., ii. The basis of these narratives is clearly traditional. The alleged circumstances of the birth of Christ, so far as they touched earth and could be borne witness to, would naturally remain for a considerable time in the keeping of the Holy Family. There would be no disclosure to a wider circle. Only when those who came to regard Him as One sent from God began to reflect on the mystery of what seemed to them a dual personality, arose a disposition to inquire into His origin. The narratives themselves plainly reveal their sources. The troubled mind, followed by the self-dedication of Mary, show the instructor of St. Luke. Equally clearly does St. Matthew's story of the doubt and hesitation of Joseph proclaim the source of his knowledge. The subject lay outside the scheme of St. Mark, when, perhaps as early as A.D. 55, he began to put into writing St. Peter's reminiscences of the public ministry. But reflection and surmise were already stirring in disciples' minds, as they watched the bearing of their Master and heard His words. The first and third Evangelists sought to deal with it; and the simple, restrained beauty of their narratives goes far to show that, in their acceptance of tradition, they were not forsaking the groundwork of historic fact.

For what is the nature of tradition whether of an event or a truth? As its name denotes, it is something delivered or handed on and received by others, or it would perish at its birth. Directly it passes to another it becomes the object of criticism, more or less intelligent, according to the capacity of the receiver. In the prologue of St. Luke we get what might be called the natural history of Gospel tradition.

(1) There are the eye-witnesses of the Incarnate Word from the beginning—ἀπ' ἀρχῆς—of His Ministry. (2) There is the fact that many persons, moved by the vital importance of preserving for the Church at large what the witnesses had told them, drew up statements of what they heard. (3) St. Luke himself, professing perfect understanding of all things from the very first—ἄνωθεν—enshrined his knowledge in a document that by its own intrinsic excellence outlived the rest and, though written for the personal use of his friend Theophilus, became, by common approval and consent, one of the Four Holy Gospels of the Christian Church.

It is only right that the variations to which tradition is subject—as, for instance, the differences in detail of the Gospel accounts of the Resurrection—should be submitted to careful criticism. It is only reasonable to look for some divergence in separate narratives of the same event. But, rightly regarded, such divergence is a mark of truth. "A really conclusive

agreement is not, as one would naturally imagine, a complete resemblance between two recitals, it is the interlacing together (*croisement*) of two different recitals which only agree in certain points. . . . It is the points of agreement in these divergent affirmations which constitute the scientific establishment of historic facts."*

But a more serious question arises. Can we regard the facts and truths of religion as dependent, for their validity and their claim on our acceptance, upon what has occurred in time and space? Are not the temporal and the eternal on different planes? Can the one certify the other? Can the immutable be revealed by what is contingent and relative? Theoretically the two classes of entities seem to stand apart as mutually independent of one another. Practically, we know that past events can and do enter into the spiritual experience of men. The facts persist and they present themselves to our minds, they lay claim to our faith. "An event is something which has happened and cannot be undone."† "The realities themselves change not, the Faith, the Life in them change not: only our understanding, our articulation of the Facts and of the Faith grow and adapt themselves to this abiding Faith and to these persistent Facts."‡ As created beings, we live in time and place. But our minds can range beyond these limits and find contact with what belongs to the eternal order. Our knowledge is conditioned by the limitations of our finite nature. "We know in part." History itself "never yields mathematical demonstration even as to the brute facts—as to their happenedness [*sic*]: still less can history of itself alone penetrate to the inner meaning of these happenednesses."§ But what we apprehend may not only be true as far as it goes; it may be sufficient for our needs. A past fact or event, occurring at a definite time and place, can influence and mould the whole of our spiritual life. It has come to us by the external action of tradition. Benedetto Croce has recently argued strongly against the attempt of the advocates of "futurism" (*futurismo*) to depreciate the value of the past. He shows how it lives on in the present and forms much of the fabric of our life.‖ It is just at this point that tradition makes its appeal for acceptance and becomes a practical factor in thought and conduct. The

* Langlois et Seignobos, *Introduction aux Études Historiques*, p. 173. *Cf.* A. E. Taylor, *The Faith of a Moralist*, ii. p. 140: "The descriptions we possess, like all *bona fide* independent narratives of real events, are not completely consistent."

† Professor Em. Radl of Prague at the International Congress of Philosophy, 1930. *Proceedings*, p. 108.

‡ Baron F. v. Hügel, *Essays and Addresses*, i., p. 268.

§ F. v. Hügel, *op. cit.*, i., p. 263.

‖ *Antistoricismo.* Proceedings of the International Congress of Philosophy, 1930, p. 78 *f.*

very fact that it *works* goes far to authenticate it.* When St. Paul exclaims "I am crucified with Christ," he avows his consciousness that the external fact of past history in time and space is so realized as fact and so taken up into his own personal experience that, in a sense, the mystery of the Cross is being enacted afresh in his own life of self-sacrifice and devotion to his Master's cause. So far is the tradition of the event from being opposed to its effect in his own spiritual life and experience, that it is true to say that without the historical factual occurrence there would have been no such dedicated life, no Apostolic mission to record. Without the historic fact there would have been no personal experience.

The antithesis, which, as we have seen, is now so frequently drawn between tradition and experience, has no logical validity. Each has its own part to play in the working out of the Christian life. Experience without that knowledge of the past which is supplied by tradition is uninformed and therefore valueless. Tradition without experience is mere externalism—the fact or truth, however clearly apprehended, is not appropriated; it is not taken into the life; it is not our own. In the quest for truth and certainty we need them both. Yet it is often to be observed that those who are the least informed on the subject in question are the most dogmatic in the assertion of their own judgment and of its infallibility. Indeed, the inexperience of youth is not merely regarded as pardonable, but as establishing a right to set aside the authority of the spiritual experts of former times. And yet we cannot understand the present without reference to the past. "History," says Radl, "is the very bone and flesh of the spirit; no idea can enter into consciousness if it has no previous idea to rely upon." "The past in history is a necessary foundation of present events."† Its presence in authentic history rests on solid fact. To set it aside as of no account on the ground that it does not commend itself to one's own view of life—however circumscribed and defective that view may be—is to offend against the ordinary dictates of common sense.

It is characteristic of the Christian religion to appeal to history, to what has actually happened in time and space, "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you"‡—a Gospel which, as it has passed, by tradition, from one to another, has received the assent of saints and martyrs and been confirmed by their own experience of its power. It is to that personal experience—the consent of a man's whole being—that the Christian tradition makes its appeal. Without the tradition,

* *Cf.* A. E. Taylor, *op. cit.*, ii., p. 223.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 109.

‡ 1 St. John i. 3.

experience would have no material for its exercise, no foundation of fact on which to work. "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?"* When the Samaritans of Sychar said to the woman, "Now we believe not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world," they spoke from their own experience; yet, it *was* her saying, "He told me all that ever I did," which first drew their attention and led to their faith and knowledge.†

C. F. NOLLOTH.

TWO STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL OUTLOOK OF THE TRACTARIANS

II. KEBLE AND PUSEY

1. KEBLE'S DETACHMENT

IF Newman's was, as Liddon remarks, the philosophic mind of the Oxford Movement, the organizer of its thought, he himself ascribes the primary authorship of the movement to Keble, and says of Pusey that when he, "ὁ μέγας," joined it, "he at once gave to us a position and a name," a "head and centre." Keble's influence was not that of the intellectual brilliance which first made him famous in Oxford. To that he was a hard master. He, unlike his fellows in the Movement, distrusted everything other than the directly spiritual in life or work. Von Hügel's criticism of it as "not really Catholic" because "incapable of taking interest in anything that was not directly, technically religious," forgetting the God of nature in the God of grace,‡ so far as it is true is due to the mind of Keble. It was the mind of a saint; it was a mind spiritually of deepest tenderness and beauty as well as severity; but if von Hügel is right it was not the mind of Catholicism at its fullest and richest. Its characteristic quality was that of reverence. Because of its reverence it loved to feel itself under authority; and therefore it found congruous to itself not only the high doctrine of the Church in which it was brought up, but also the high doctrine of the State. Faith and obedience were the duty

* Rom. x. 14.

† "None of us can escape from intellectual disaster unless he is ready to walk somewhere in life by the faith which comes by hearing; no man's soul can successfully walk by its own private light alone" (A. E. Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 405).

‡ *Selected Letters*, p. 254.

of the subject. All of Keble's spirit is in those lovely but quietist lines of his:

> "O Lord my God, do Thou Thy Holy Will;
> I will lie still.
> I will not stir, lest I forsake Thine Arm
> Or break the charm
> That lulls me, clinging to my Father's breast
> In perfect rest."

It seems to have been the sheer spiritual force of this mind which opened to Newman the vision of the Catholic Church, a supernatural authority with a teaching which laid claim on men, demanding depth in a superficial age and far horizons in a materialist one. It is possible that its effect on Pusey was not so happy. Where Newman's Evangelicalism needed supplementing and his intellectual interests regulating, Pusey, scholar rather than philosopher, was drawn back from the political interests of his youth and the critical interests of his German studies into a narrower groove not really natural to him. The surrender expressed in so many words in his letter respecting his Gunpowder Plot sermon of 1837 is curiously commented upon, as we shall see, by the inconsistency of the sermon in itself and with other thought of Pusey's.

The reverence of Keble's mind, as it attached itself to the men, the institutions, the wisdom which have gone before, is perhaps best illustrated by his letters to Sir John Coleridge on the Oxford University Reform Bill of 1854:* "I certainly could not myself have been a party to it, were it only for the needless, and as it seems to me irreverent degree of interference with Founders' Wills; but in this, I believe, not even Pusey agrees with me. I thought I had got over it: but as it was my first thought, so it has come over me stronger than ever." "J. D. himself told me the other day 'he did not care for Founders and Benefactors'; they were his very words." "It is not so much the proposed amount of change that I deprecated, as the cool way in which Parliament was decreeing, without asking those most concerned, that Founders' natural preferences should go for nothing . . . that endowments may be seized not only for doing harm, but for not doing all the good they might."† It is this same reverence which is the backbone of his political Toryism. In a sermon of 1843, *The Abounding of Iniquity*, he selects for special mention two forms of iniquity, viz., impurity

* *A Memoir of Rev. John Keble*, by J. D. Coleridge, p. 380.

† Pusey, who "did not agree with him," had the wider idea of authority as inherent in a *living* body: "I suppose that the Church ought to have the power of regulating everything entrusted to her, and that all which Founders bequeath to the glory of God is in fact committed to the Church."

and irreverence. "Another sort of irreverence there is, most plainly and undeniably too common among us . . . disrespect for those whom God has set over us, to be, in any manner and measure, in His stead. Parents—*e.g.*, how seldom do we now hear them speaking as with absolute right to command their children. . . . Towards kings, how greatly has our reverence diminished by the modern notion of liberty!" Or again on Easter Day, 1849, on *Our Lord's Absolute Dominion over His Redeemed*:

"Some, too many even in this Christian land, will proudly (say), 'They belong to themselves, they are free and independent, and never were in bondage to any man' . . . whispers of the sullen, unruly, irreligious spirit (saying), to those who are in God's place, if they dare not say to God Himself, 'Who is Lord over us?'"

So, too, the *Lectures on Poetry*, in contrasting Homer's sympathy with the poor with that of Burns, point out that the latter was "unable to treat the rich with courteous gentleness," but "rails against" them; and Milton's Sonnet on his Blindness is said to be marred by signs "that in political life he would . . . side . . . with the restless populace," unlike Homer, who in the same affliction manifested "happy contentment with the ways of heaven."*

But although there is indeed political preaching of Keble's, in so far as he thus fearlessly identifies Christianity with obedience to authority, temporal as well as spiritual, things temporal are for him always only means to, or shadows of, things spiritual. They have no value of their own, and complete detachment from them is inexorably demanded of all God's servants.

"Why should you mind these earthly and temporal differences? . . . What can it signify to (Christians), really, if one be born in a higher, another in a lower place; if one be richer and another poorer, or anything else of that kind? In good truth, it does not signify at all."†

"You read and hear probably, a great deal, at least in the newspapers, of the pomp and vanities of this wicked world, the grand and splendid and dazzling uses to which worldly men convert the mammon of unrighteousness. Are you proof against all this? Can you, for Christ's sake, pass from such reading or hearing, without grudging, without envy, without a sigh, to your own harder work, it may be, and scantier fare, saying in your hearts, 'It is the Lord, the Lord Christ, let Him do what seemeth Him good'?"‡

Maritain has said that the Catholic religion demands a world so ordered that it is possible for men to live Christianly without being constantly required to manifest heroic virtue. But here

* Quoted in Dr. Lock's *Life of Keble*, p. 34.
† Sermon on *Christ in All*. ‡ Advent Sermons.

is what Keble preached to his poor villagers in the hungry forties:

"Learn from our Lord's example (in His Fast) to make much of your hunger and thirst, as special helps to bring you nearer to Him. This by His grace will effectually keep you from that which is of course one of your greatest dangers; the devil will in vain tempt you to take his advice how to get your bread. This we know was the way in which he tempted our blessed Lord in His hunger, 'command that these stones be made bread,' as he might come to any of you in low circumstances, and whisper, 'Here is this or that portion of your neighbour's property within your reach; cannot you turn it into money or money's worth to keep yourself and your family from starving?' Thus has the Evil One before now spoken craftily to many a poor man's heart and seduced him into the deadly sin of dishonesty. (But) . . . the poor honest Christian with a holy stubbornness . . . (may) turn (his) enforced fast into a devout service, most acceptable to the Lord."

The same thought is repeated in a later sermon and remembered again in that on the Feeding of the Five Thousand. It was evidently a favourite consolation. There is a deep spiritual tenderness in such an outlook; but no sense that these things ought not so to be, and, surely, no right human sympathy.

The contrast with Pusey is specially marked here. But before coming to that point, Pusey's more general position falls to be considered.

2. Pusey on Church and State

It has already been suggested that Pusey was always interested in politics. In his younger days he ranked himself politically as a Whig of the Fox tradition, and therefore in some sympathy with the movement towards democracy. Under Keble's influence he believed himself converted to Toryism. But in spite of the Fifth of November sermon and the Appendices with which he attempted to justify it, his Toryism differed *toto cœlo* from Keble's, and for this reason—that Pusey had, as Keble had not, a sense of the reality of the natural order, and therefore of the civil order. Authoritarianism he did indeed believe in; but the essence of his idea of Toryism was not that, but the fact that it was a relic of the idea of Christendom; Church and State as the two orders in one society, with the Church setting the standard which the State enforced.

"I could have been a Tory," he wrote in 1865, "but 1830 ended Toryism"; 1830 was the date, not of the Reform Bill, but of Roman Catholic emancipation, with its admission of the principle that for the State religious opinion was a matter of indifference. Writing to Gladstone in 1847 of the further application of this principle in the proposal to emancipate the Jews, he said: "You would put great difficulties in the way of

those who wish or are bound to pray for Parliament as Christian; I could pray for it only as apostate, and as having prepared by this step for the coming of Antichrist. . . . I could take no other interest in it than, I believe, St. Paul would have had me take in Nero." To the modern mind these sentiments sound shockingly intolerant. But they are in fact an expression of the attempt of the Movement to keep the world from drifting from its allegiance to Christ. The State, as Pusey says elsewhere, "has no guide but the Church; and if it rejects that, it must flounder endlessly. I see not what standard it can substitute." Not till much later did it become possible to hold this view in conjunction with acceptance of a free and secular state. Meantime it was not mere bigotry which saw "with regret, each link of the old system broken, both with regard to the State and to the Church," and the State "assuming a nondescript character which will, in the end," said Pusey, "be infidel."

Thus if Pusey's Fifth of November sermon be compared with Keble's Assize Sermon, it appears that Keble's is consistent with itself and with passive obedience; Pusey's falls into two parts which are never related, the first concerning God's judgment on *nations*, the second on the *Church's* duty of non-resistance. Keble, though his sermon is entitled *National* Apostasy, declares at its very beginning that "God dealt formerly with the Jewish people in a manner analogous to that in which He deals now, not so much with Christian nations, as with the souls of individual Christians." It quite properly follows that, though a nation as such may be warned that it is becoming alienated from God, and is manifesting that tendency by the temper in which it deals with His Church, the essential question is how the individual Christian whose lot is "cast on such times of decay and danger" should conduct himself, and how the Church, as such, should act. They will intercede, remonstrate, and submit. They will be faithful in their personal duties. They will rest in the assurance that all things are under the hand of God.

But Pusey's sermon begins with the statement that the Old Testament illuminates for us all other history, and teaches us to acknowledge God's providential dealings with the world. Here we have clearly stated Pusey's view of the world as such—a sacramental view; and it is the view which he consistently holds, and states almost in the same words, for example, fifteen years later.*

* "God . . . is the author of all, the End of all. . . . Without Him, in the region of thought, everything is dead; as without Him everything which is, would at once cease to be. . . . History, without God, is a chaos without design, or aim, or end. Political economy, without God, would be a selfish teaching about the acquisi-

"In history, morals, poetry, legislation, philosophy, language, physics, religion,—heaven and earth, a body of clay and a spirit breathed into its nostrils by the life-giving Spirit, stand over against each other, and whoso lifteth not up the earthly to the heavenly will bring down the heavenly to the earthly. . . . God is not separate from His Providence and His laws. . . . In all He Himself acteth, personally present and personally measuring out to every nation its own portion according to its works," though it may belong to "that His larger family, who had 'gone away into a far country,' to follow their own desires uncontrolled."

But at a later point the sermon slips in a quite curious manner from this doctrine of God's providence over nations to compare the political action of the Papists in the Gunpowder Plot to the political action of Churchmen in the Revolution of 1688. His text, "Stand still, and see the Salvation of the Lord," images the constant duty laid upon God's chosen; for the Cross has shown "that non-resistance was strength." Incidentally he controverts a statement of Bellarmine's that "if the Christians formerly did not depose Nero and Diocletian and Julian the Apostate and Valens the Arian and the like, it was because they wanted secular strength." "Rather they had strength not to resist." But there is no word as to the citizen's duty. "The earthly" is not "lifted up to the heavenly"; it is simply left out of view.

This inconsistency of thought, or at least these two unrelated lines of thought, are traceable throughout Pusey's writings.* The dropping of the temporal order from his mind is significantly noticeable in two sermons where, if anywhere, recognition of it would be looked for. That on *Thy Kingdom Come* declares that the Kingdom is threefold: in the soul, in the Church, and in the final Kingdom in glory. It speaks of the extension of the Church throughout the world, but has no reference to what that should mean in terms of a world order; though even so Pusey cannot refrain from a prefatory paragraph pointing out that in one sense "He rules and over-rules all created things by their will or against their will." In the other sermon, *Jesus the Redeemer*, Pusey sets out to answer the question, "What would be the aspect of a redeemed world? A world, I mean, which knew that it was redeemed." Perhaps it is the danger of the saint to be so wrapped up in the personal God he adores

---

tion of wealth, making the larger portion of mankind animate machines for its production; physics, without God, would be but a dull enquiry into certain meaningless phenomena; ethics, without God, would be a varying rule, without principle or substance, or centre, or regulating hand. . . ."

* So Liddon says in one place that politics gradually faded out of Pusey's view; "he had in later life little heart for themes which did not directly concern the welfare of souls"; but in another that "all his life" Pusey kept his eye on political events, saying, "We may see, perhaps, what God is doing, if we do not know what He means to do."

as to forget the world in the Vision. For the answer to his question which leaps to Pusey's mind is the joy it would be to live in a world where the Father's love was no longer grieved by His children's lack of response, and the beauty of such a world of love. "And there will be no sameness in their love. Out of each love will spring forth with its own individual beauty and loveliness of love." In the white radiance of the Throne the prismatic colours are swallowed up. Yet here, too, at the beginning the listeners were reminded how He ruled in hearts which knew Him or knew Him not; how He gave to Joseph or even to Scipio his chastity; or to Regulus his self-sacrifice; or how at this moment He is, through the Holy Spirit, "engraving the image of God upon every piece and parcel of the rational creation."

On the other hand, his political interest is shown—*e.g.*, when he encourages his brother Philip to see in a political career an opportunity of serving God, more particularly in its opportunities of serving the poor. "To have undone that griping Scotch Report, and brought people to think of the poor in Scotland, and see how to relieve them, would be no slight thing, were it the work of a whole life." And again, when Philip Pusey is contemplating a tour in Ireland for the study of the causes of distress there, Dr. Pusey quotes to him, not only the Christian text, "Ye have done it unto Me," but the prophetic (and note the Hebrew Professor's personal translation) "Seek judgment, righten [*sic*] the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." Again it is consistent that he quite naturally uses the unexpected phrase "a Christian prison," in emphatically condemning the existing (1864) state of things in Oxford jail: and refers in his *Minor Prophets* to the law of weights and measures as a point in which "human law recognizes the Divine law."

3. Mammonism and Pauperism

Pusey has in common with Newman a constant vision of the hideousness of the civilization growing up under the rule of what he calls "our national idol, Mammon." But he adds to it a passionate pity for, and indignation on behalf of, the poor, and an abiding sense that their sufferings are directly due to definite and social sin. The sermons on the Irish Famine in 1847, on *Dives* in 1865, on *Our Pharisaism* in 1868, on *Christ's Acts of Love* in 1882, all tell the same tale, as does passage after passage in his comment on the Minor Prophets. It is hard to choose quotations from among so much that is striking. A brief extract from a sermon on *Christian Zeal* perhaps summarizes best:

"This city of mingled magnificence and penury, of multiplied luxury and misery bounded only by man's power to suffer, in which there are miles upon miles of human habitations, dense, thronged, compressed, stifled together, so that the moral atmosphere is choked by the accumulation of misery. . . ."*

He accuses the ineffectiveness and insufficiency of our Christian Charity:

"Christians, as much forgotten by Christians as if we did not bear the name of our common Saviour . . . answer, in one varied wail, prolonged and swelling in dissonant sounds of misery. . . . 'Where? We have not heard its name; we have not felt its fruits; we have been hungry, and it gave us no meat; we have been naked and it clothed us not; we have been sick and in prison and it visited us not': the Voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto Me from the ground."

In the same sermon;—the stigmata of Mammon are visible enough:

"Zeal for getting wealth we see. It marks and sharpens the countenance; often it furrows it untimely. . . . Self-interest is the life of our enterprise, the nerve of our commerce, the mainspring of our inventions, the soul of our activity, the idol of our worship; would we may not have to say, the dæmon author of our greatness."

In the sermon *Why did Dives lose his soul?*

"Rachel weeping for her children, and now, by a worse lot, *is* comforted when they are not; for it is better to see them stretched out in death, than to hear the cries of their unstilled hunger."

"This great Babylon . . . confusing necessity, luxury, comfort in one reckless following of self-will."

And, before a West End congregation, as it began its Lenten pieties on Ash Wednesday; and at a time when the sin of London's streets was commonly held unmentionable before Christian women:

"The weavers of your gay clothing starve, while you make a show of their toil. . . . The women who fit your dresses perish untimely (some hard by) by their wasting toil. It is a known class of women, which ekes out its scanty wages by occasional deadly, degrading sin."

He ends in a fierce outburst of almost Dantesque imagination:

"If you"—you, the comfortable wearers of the finery thus purchased—"do not amend your ways, what remains for you but the robe of everlasting fire?"

The Preface to the *Minor Prophets* is perfectly clear that part of the prophet's office is the preaching of social justice;

* More briefly in another sermon, on *Fasting*: "Our miles of misery in our large towns."

contrasting in this with Newman's ignoring the idea in his *Prophetical Office:* and the comment throughout has the same ring of moral indignation as the words of the prophets themselves. In the comment on Amos iii., for example, he has a thought on covetousness which must have been a reflection of his own on his own time, for it is not immediately suggested either by Amos or St. John:

"They know not to do right. . . . When our Lord and God came to His own, they said, we know not whence He is. And this blindness was wrought by covetousness, which blindeth the eyes even of the wise, as he adds, 'who store with violence and robbery.' . . . He adds, as an aggravation, 'in their palaces.' . . . What was wrung from the poor, laid up *in palaces!* Yet what else is it to cheapen luxuries at the cost of the wages of the poor?"

On Micah iii., "they build up Zion with blood," he shows that he well knew the distinction between the poverty blessed by our Lord and the misery of industrialism. It is interesting also that he quotes to this effect from Lacordaire:

"In our wealthy nation, this term poverty describes a condition of other days. We have had to coin a new name to designate the misery, offspring of our material prosperity. From our wealthy towns (as from those of Flanders) ascends to heaven against us 'the cry of "pauperism," *i.e.*, the cry of distress . . . by an unexpected curse issuing from the very development of wealth. The political economy of unbelief has been crushed by facts on all the theatres of human activity and industry.' Truly we build up Zion with blood when we cheapen luxuries and comforts at the price of souls, use Christian toil like brute strength, tempt men to dishonesty and women to other sin, to eke out the scanty wages which alone our selfish thirst for cheapness allows . . . or the commercial prosperity which we have made our god. . . . Our commercial greatness is the price of *His* blood . . . anew slaying Christ, and from the selfsame motives as those who crucified Him."

The quotation is from Lacordaire, Conferences, I., ii., p. 300.

4. Pusey's Call to Social Service

So far as Mammonism is concerned, Pusey prophesies against it, and there leaves it, upon the conscience of his hearers. But for the relief of its victims he has a policy. In a time when "social services" as yet were not, he believed that the Church could and should supply them. His view of almsgiving was not that it was the spasmodic kindliness of individuals. As in the days of Cyprian at Carthage or of Gregory in Rome, it should be the organized effort of the Church to help where help was needed. In his learned work on *The Councils of the Church* (1857) he states as one reason for desiring restoration of synodical

activity in the English Church her responsibility towards the heathenized and degraded masses:

> "The Church herself ought to debate upon remedies, and should not leave to individual effort the work of the whole. We need missions among the poor of our towns; organized bodies of clergy living among them; licensed preachers in the streets and lanes of our cities; *brotherhoods, or guilds, which should replace socialism*;* or sisterhoods of mercy. We need clergy to penetrate our mines, to emigrate with our emigrants, to shift with our shifting population, *to grapple with our manufacturing system as the Apostles did with the slave-system of the ancient world.*"

Long before he wrote these words Pusey had set himself to pioneer work along these lines. His foundation of St. Saviour's, Leeds, was (as one of its first clergy wrote) an attempt "to forge a new weapon for the use of our spiritual mother" in her work of redemption of body, mind and soul in what was at that date one of the most appalling of our factory towns. A college of priests, with an associate body of lay brethren, set out to accomplish whatever their hands could find to do for their people from the focus of the parish altar. It was not long before the cholera of 1849 tested their charity to the utmost. St. Saviour's, Leeds, was the first of those "Ritualist slum parishes" which are typical of the Revival in its second generation.

"Sisterhoods of Mercy," too, found in Pusey their first Director. Probably it was this love of his for the poor which made him quick to buy up the opportunity when, inspired as it seems by the example of Kaiserswerth and by Mrs. Fry's visit thither in 1840, a group of laymen, with the approval of Bishop Blomfield, formed a Committee (in 1844) to consider the establishment of a Sisterhood for the benefit of the destitute poor of London. Pusey, Newman, and Keble had indeed been discussing the revival of the Religious Life since 1839; but Newman doubted. "I despair," he said, "of such societies being made externally." Again Pusey's faith in "the lifting up of the earthly to the heavenly" was seen, and when the Laymen's Committee consulted him, he was ready to accept responsibility. So the pioneer Sisterhood of Charity came into being in Park Village in February, 1845; and not long after Lydia Sellon, also under Pusey's direction, founded the Society of the Holy Trinity at Devonport. Schools, orphanages, nursing (both hospital and district) and the personal contacts comprehended under the term "mission work" were his ideals for them; and his hope was not only the revival of the dedicated life in all its spiritual force and beauty—the vocation he fostered in

* Pusey must surely here be accepting the idea of the Christian Socialists as to co-operative societies. The italics are ours.

his own daughter Lucy—but here, too, "the forging of a new weapon for our spiritual mother" adequate to the sorrows of her disinherited children.

ὁ μέγας, said Newman of Pusey. "Mr. Great-Heart," we might translate. "The Interpreter then called for a man-servant of his, one Greatheart, and bid him take sword, and helmet, and shield, 'and take these my (children),' said he, 'and conduct them to the house called Beautiful, at which place they will rest next.'"

RUTH KENYON.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE complete set of Dr. Arnold's Winchester letters, from which we print a second selection this month, is to be had in pamphlet form from Messrs. Wells, College Street, Winchester, price 1s. net.

Sibbes and Simeon (Hodder and Stoughton, 1s. net) is the title which the Bishop of Durham has given to his recently published "Essay on Patronage Trusts." Written in his usual direct and forcible style, the Essay contains a most powerful criticism of the system of Party Trusts, and a plea for the abolition of Trustee Patronage. Such Trusts "operate ceaselessly and steadily," he says, "as an *imperium in imperio*, lowering the standard of discipline, and buttressing the unnatural rigidity of partisan churchmanship." And on this text the Bishop delivers himself of a message which abounds in penetrating judgments, weighty historical considerations, and scholarly analysis of terminology. Our readers will profit by it and enjoy it.

In *The Way of Churchmanship* (S.P.C.K., 4d. net) Dr. Lowther Clarke, with the help of Members of the Staff of St. Christopher's College, Blackheath, has put together some most helpful "Suggestions for the Religious Training of Little Children." No detail of the child's mind and attitude on these matters escapes the writer; and parents and teachers will find it singularly valuable.

NOTE

"THE DEAD ARE RAISED UP": AN INTERPRETATION.

The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up. On no theory of Gospel origins are we justified in rejecting these words recorded by St. Luke (vii. 22, *cf.* Matt. xi. 5) from the primitive tradition of our Lord's utterances. Nor may we say that the words which follow, "and the poor have the gospel preached to them," give the clue to their interpretation, so that the blind, for example, may be taken as the spiritually blind. Our Lord was believed to have raised the dead, and doubtless Himself shared the belief. Is this a hard saying, inevitably a stumbling-block to the modern mind? To me it seems rather to be a wonderful aid to faith, as I shall hope to show.

The incident in which the saying occurs in St. Luke follows the Raising of the Widow's Son. This is the only story of raising the dead which we can profitably study, so far as our present purpose is concerned. Our Lord said of Jairus' daughter "she is not dead," and it is best to take His

words literally. And St. John's story of the Raising of Lazarus has difficulties of its own.

Our Lord with his disciples and a throng of followers was approaching Nain and met a funeral procession coming out of the town. The body of a young man was laid on a stretcher, borne by several friends; the widowed mother and a concourse of mourners accompanied the body. We may suppose that a cloth covered the body, the face being unveiled.

Death had taken place some hours previously. Medical science was crude to a degree, and mistakes must have occurred sometimes. Was this a case of mistaken diagnosis?

Jesus, after saying to the mother, "Weep not," came to the stretcher and laid His hand on it. The bearers stopped. Jesus said: "Young man, I say unto thee, Arise," and the dead man sat up.

What precisely was the miracle? Let us first be clear on two points. (*a*) The New Testament insists that the Resurrection was unique—"Christ the firstfruits, afterwards they that are Christ's."* It is inconceivable that the young man was thought to have passed into the other world, and to have been recalled to this world, anticipating the Lord Himself. (*b*) Our Lord refused to work miracles contrary to nature, to produce "signs from heaven" that would compel belief. St. Luke four chapters earlier has given the Temptation story which teaches this unmistakably.

Next let us ask what death is. It is the end of a long process. Throughout life the processes of building up and breaking down the cells are at work. Broadly speaking, after fifty we begin to go downhill; the breaking down preponderates over the building up. Finally this affects the vital organs, which, even apart from accident or disease, are unable to function any longer. The long process comes to an end.

But the actual dying is itself a process rather than an instantaneous event, and sometimes it is prolonged during a period of suspended animation when none can say whether death has supervened or not.

Recently a case was reported in the Press of a boy who died. Some hours after death the doctors tried massage of the heart with success. The boy revived and lived for twelve hours after he had legally died—any of the doctors would have signed his death certificate.

This then is how I understand the miracle. The young man was in a state of suspended animation. No decay had set in, but in the normal course it would soon have begun. The great Healer knew by intuition that this was so and said to the mother, "Weep not." He laid His hand on the body, and health and life immediately radiated out from Him. The conscious part of the brain, the upper levels of the cortex, was dormant, dead if you like, but the lower part, the seat of the unconscious motives of the mind, was still alive and could receive impressions. Modern psychology lays great stress on the capacity of the unconscious to receive impressions, at a time when the conscious is stilled. The impressionability of a sleeping child, in particular, is well known. If death is a process, the first part to die will be that which was developed last in the history of the race (and of the individual), namely the conscious reasoning part of the brain; the unconscious, which we share with our animal ancestors, will follow. In the case of the widow's son, when Jesus touched his body, in the depths of the unconscious a desire to live awoke, which when

* The exception in Matt. xxvii. 52, the raising of the bodies of the saints after the Crucifixion, is rightly suspect.

Jesus spoke stirred the nerves into action, so that the young man sat up.

Have we explained the story away? Have we not rather magnified the miracle so that its appeal is enhanced? A mere wonder-worker, who could bring a spirit back from Hades, as the witch of Endor did, has no attractive power. Rather we see Jesus in the fullness of His radiant manhood, living always in His Father's presence, trusting Him wholly. He sees the young man and intuitively knows that he is not dead. Anyone else would have instantaneously dismissed the intuition as incredible, but Jesus' faith in His Father knows no bounds. Never yet has the Father failed Him, so with complete abandonment He believes and acts on His belief. Out of His Spirit-filled manhood flows a healing power which can recall to life even one in a state of suspended animation—whether technically dead or not we need not ask.

The miracle remains, but our attention has turned from the physical wonder to the wonder of the spiritual and psychological process in the mind of the Saviour. Surely we are short-sighted in discarding miracles from our preaching so lightly as we are wont to do. The earliest "good news" was that God was with Jesus, doing mighty works in Him. Shall we ever win men if we rob Jesus of this power which marked Him out from other men? There is a prejudice against miracles so long as they are thought to be mere mighty works, but when they are regarded as the natural expression of a psychologically perfect mental life, free from all fears and inhibitions and able to respond fully and immediately to the divine voice, then they become once more "evidence of Christianity" such as the modern world needs.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Zeitschrift für die A.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1932. Heft 1.

K. BUDDE continues his exhaustive commentary on Isaiah i.-v.

C. R. NORTH (Birmingham) contributes in English a fascinating essay on "The Religious Aspect of Hebrew Kingship." Hebrew Kingship arrived late on the scene and naturally took over the associations which the institution had in the surrounding nations. From the Tel-el-Amarna Letters we learn that Canaanite kings were anointed. The purpose was to confer divine power. Elijah is bidden anoint Elisha in 1 Kings xix. 16, but it is an isolated instance. It does not appear in the sequel that he did so; probably "anoint," so far as Elisha is concerned, only means "appoint." Priests seem not to have been anointed until the time of the Priestly Document, when they have succeeded to the prerogatives of the priest-kings. The most striking example of the life-giving power of the king is found in Lam. iv. 20, where "the anointed of Yahweh" is called the life-breath of his people—"the breath of our nostrils." But the king was always on the human side rather than the divine, representing the people to God, not God to the people. It is significant that Damascus thought a Hebrew king by his touch could cure "the King's evil" (2 Kings v. 6), but the king indignantly repudiated the idea, saying "Am I God?"

H. THIERSCH gives an account of the excavations at Tell-en-hasbe (2000-1500 B.C.), where a type of temple has been found resembling the temples of the Eastern Mediterranean (Crete, Cyprus, etc.), the plan of which is a nave with two aisles of lower pitch and a rectangular narthex. The cultic object was placed in the middle of the nave. The plan is that of a Christian church. A note describes the finding of a jar handle stamp on the same site with the word *massah*, "unleavened bread." The jar was probably for the wine drunk at the feast.

W. K. L. C.

Ephemerides Theologicæ Lovanienses. January. 1932.

In this number Fr. Dumont, S.J., concludes his series of articles on the alleged innate desire of the human soul for supernatural blessedness and direct vision. The present instalment is chiefly occupied with an examination of the doctrine of St. Thomas on this point. The crucial passage comes from the *Summa contra Gentiles*, iii. 53, where St. Thomas seems to countenance the view that the intuitive vision of the Divine Essence is the natural end of man. Fr. Dumont argues that this is not strictly his meaning at all; in the very next section the necessity of supernatural grace is insisted upon. Furthermore, this *Summa* is addressed to philosophic Moslems who themselves admit divine assistance and revelation. The position remains that no end can be termed natural which cannot be attained by the natural forces of that whose end it is supposed to be, and there is nothing really incompatible in St. Thomas with this thesis. In his purely natural state man can only say, "I wish to be as happy as possible"; herein he wishes to attain to that which is clearly within his powers, and is, in fact, his due. But by an "elicited" or conditional desire, if he sees, as he does see, that God could grant him a happiness which exceeds the proportion of his nature as such, he can go on to say, "I wish to attain to this excess of beatitude, if it should please God to grant it to me." But does even this "excess" include the intuitive vision of the Divine Essence? The most that we can say is that it may do so implicitly. Indeed, no philosophy can establish that a form of activity proper to an infinite Being could be communicated to a creature which at the same time remains a creature and finite. This we can only learn from revelation.

The other principal Article in this number is a lengthy Latin discussion on the *Genuina ratio impedimenti impotentiæ*, the treatment of which is almost more medical and legal than strictly theological.

The reviews give accounts of a number of new biblical handbooks in Latin and French.

W. R. V. BRADE.

A WEDDING HYMN

EVERY folk in ancient story
  Were with wedlock well content:
What was once the Pagan's glory
  Is the Christian's Sacrament.
Every age and people own,
"'Tis not good to be alone."

God, who chose a people, rather
  Than destroy the human race,
Led his people as a Father,
  Taught thro' Faith to glimpse His face:
And the seed of Abraham
Witnessed to the great "I AM."

Jesus Christ, His Son, our Saviour,
  Bade th' astounded servants see
His miraculous behaviour
  At the feast in Galilee:
Turning water into wine,
Making human love divine.

And in these, the latter ages,
  God unto His folk returns;
On the pens of Seers and Sages
  Still the Holy Spirit burns.
May we through the Holy Ghost
Make each day a Pentecost!

Therefore, Father, Son, and Spirit,
  Grant unto Thy children here
Love—Thy Kingdom—to inherit,
  Blest by all who hold them dear—
Knowing well, through good or ill,
Love alone can work Thy will!

W. W. GRUNDY.

REVIEWS

EXORCISM AND HEALING OF THE SICK. By R. M. Woolley, D.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The comparatively early death of Canon Woolley has deprived the Church of one of the most learned of our far too small body of competent liturgiologists, which has been still further depleted by the lamented death of Dr. Brightman. We owe to Dr. Woolley *The Liturgy of the Primitive Church*, 1910; *The Bread of the Eucharist*, 1913; *Coronation Rites*, 1915; *The Canterbury Benedictional*, 1916; *The Gilbertine Rite*, 1922-23; *John Longlond's Benedictional*, 1927; and last, but not least, a very useful translation of the *Coptic Offices* (S.P.C.K., 1930) which contains the Orders for Baptism, Matrimony, Unction, Burial, and Auricular Confession.

Every work proceeding from Dr. Woolley's competent pen deserves careful study, and the present booklet is no exception. Although it has probably not received his final touches, it is a meritorious, accurate, and (within its limits) comprehensive performance. With practically all Dr. Woolley's positive results the present writer finds himself in agreement. He particularly welcomes his proof (1) that Exorcism and the Ministry of Healing were in the primitive period practically one and the same thing; and (2) that the terms Imposition of Hands and Unction were so closely related in the mind and practice of the Primitive Church that the mention of either normally implied the other as an accompaniment. In this contention Dr. Woolley has the weighty support of Dr. Magistretti, who points out that one of the most usual names for the Unction Service in mediæval Ambrosian documents is "Imposition of Hands," and claims that St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Athanasius included Unction in their use of the term "Imposition of Hands." Dr. Woolley might have strengthened his case by referring to Origen, who actually misquotes St. James as enjoining not only Unction, but also Imposition of Hands: "If any one be sick, let him call for the elders of the Church, and *let them lay their hands upon him*, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord" (*Homil.* ii., in *Levit.*, §. 4).

The only really serious defect of Dr. Woolley's work is that he fails sufficiently to recognize—indeed, he all but ignores—the very important part which the ministry of Healing (which included Exorcism) played in the official ministry first of the Apostles, and afterwards of the Bishops and Presbyters who succeeded to their pastoral office. Dr. Woolley's theory is that the Ministry of Healing was originally a charismatic and entirely

lay ministry, which only in the fourth and fifth centuries was gradually taken over to form part of the official ministry of the Hierarchy. He interprets the evidence as indicating the elevation of an originally lay charismatic ministry into an ecclesiastical and sacerdotal sacrament.

In order to make a case for this theory, Dr. Woolley is obliged to deal in what most readers will regard as a decidedly arbitrary way with much of the evidence of the New Testament. For example, he is compelled to lay the least possible stress on our Lord's solemn bestowal of the Ministry of Healing upon the Twelve, and to say next to nothing about the mighty works of healing wrought by the Apostles, upon which the Book of Acts lays so much stress. In the same minimizing spirit, he contends that the Presbyters' ministry to the sick, mentioned by St. James, was only a local custom, and not in any way representative of the practice of "the Great Church." Surely it is much more probable that the Apostles, who won so much prestige for themselves and their message by the works of healing which they performed at Jerusalem, acted similarly wherever they went, as St. Paul certainly did, working those "signs of an Apostle" (2 Cor. xii. 12), which were universally recognized as among the proper credentials of one who claimed to possess a genuine apostolic commission. There is, in fact, definite evidence that the twelve, like St. Paul, worked miracles of healing wherever they went (see Heb. ii. 3-4). That the early Church expected the successors of the Apostles, the Bishops and their assistant Presbyters, to perform similar works of healing, is evident from many testimonies. The Canons of Hippolytus, for example, which contain much primitive material, direct that at the ordination of a Bishop or Presbyter the following prayer shall be recited: "Grant to him, O Lord, a mild spirit, and power to remit sins, and grant to him power to loose all bonds of the iniquity of demons (*i.e.*, to exorcise), and to heal all diseases" (17). The Apostolic Constitutions directs the Bishop, when ordaining a Presbyter, to pray that he may be 'filled with gifts of healing' (viii. 16). Even a deacon was empowered at his ordination to exorcise (Canons of Hippolytus, 39). Special efficacy was attached to a visit paid to a sick person by the Bishop himself: "Let a deacon accompany the Bishop on all occasions, and let him point out to him the sick persons individually. For it is a great thing for a sick man to receive a visit from the prince of the priests. He recovers from his disease when the bishop comes to him, particularly if he prays for him, because the shadow of Peter healed the sick" (199; reference to Acts v. 15).

The truth is that lay exorcism and unction were always relatively unimportant. The former was indeed often appealed

to as a striking indication that supernatural healing powers inhered in the Christian Church as a whole. But from the beginning the Bishop (assisted by his Presbyters) was the principal exorcist and healer, and so remained in both the Eastern and Western Churches throughout the primitive and mediæval periods. Not only did he exorcise publicly in Church every Sunday at the Eucharist, and lay hands upon the sick who were placed before him to be healed (probably with the accompaniment of Unction), but references to episcopal exorcisms and other ministrations to the sick on other occasions are also frequent.

The frequent boasts of the Apologists and early Fathers that the humblest lay Christians could exorcise and heal more effectually than the heathen priests and magi do not imply, as Dr. Woolley strangely imagines, that Christian Bishops and Priests did not also exorcise and heal. The implication rather was that if the humblest lay members of the Christian Body possess such amazing supernatural powers, exceeding those of the priests of Æsculapius and other pagan healers, how much greater powers of the same kind were possessed by the ordained members of the Christian Hierarchy, who had received from Christ Himself an official commission to exorcise and heal in His name.

Dr. Woolley rightly draws attention to the fact that "gifts of healings" were widely possessed and exercised by the laity in early times. But this no more proves that the clergy did not also exercise these gifts with greater authority and effect, than does lay preaching prove that bishops and priests are not entrusted with the ministry of the Word in a fuller and more authoritative manner. Dr. Woolley admits that the laity, when they anointed, did so with oil previously blessed by the Bishop in church at the close of the Eucharistic Canon, but fails to perceive that this is a clear indication that anointing by the laity was only a minor auxiliary ministration, entirely subordinate to the official anointing by the Bishop and Presbyters, which was always sought for in cases of serious sickness. Just as in these days parents treat the minor illnesses of their children without calling in a doctor, but summon him immediately if the illness is likely to become serious; so in the early days of Christianity the Christian *paterfamilias* habitually kept consecrated oil in his house, and administered it with suitable prayers to any member of his household who was unwell. If, however, the sickness was, or became, serious, he obeyed the precept of St. James, and summoned the Bishop and Presbyters, that they might anoint the sick person by virtue of their apostolic office, and effect a cure by their more potent ministrations.

CHARLES HARRIS.

KONNERSREUTH. A Medical and Psychological Study of the Case of Teresa Neumann. By R. W. Hynek, M.D. Translated and adapted by Lancelot W. Sheppard. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 4s.

This is a very strange book. The author sets out to consider the case of a peasant girl who received the stigmata, and to judge it "primarily from the medical standpoint." He writes, however, not with scientific dispassionateness, but in a tone of somewhat hysterical propaganda. Moreover, he is quite sure that if the facts which he investigates are true, they must necessarily be edifying. If Teresa Neumann reproduced in her body the wounds of our Lord, we who read her story must indubitably be convinced of the truth, of the unique truth, of Roman Catholicism. That is a very bold assumption for a medical man to make.

What are the facts? (If we are merely sceptical with regard to the alleged facts, the book is of no interest to us, and should be left unread.)

On April 9, 1898, at Konnersreuth, in Bavaria, there was born, of robust country parents, a female child, who was named after St. Teresa of Avila. She grew up among peasants, attending the village school, working hard in the fields, apparently doing and feeling nothing unusual to set her apart from other girls in the village.

On March 10, 1918, Teresa Neumann, who was then working for a farmer, injured her spine, while helping to put out a fire. Later on, a second accident caused further injury to her back and set up serious internal trouble. After hospital treatment she came home, and was able to do light housework. A third accident, however, brought on convulsions, partial blindness, and other distressing symptoms. From the end of October, 1918, Teresa was bedridden, and the doctors who attended her were convinced that she would gradually grow worse until death freed her from her sufferings.

On April 29, 1923, Teresa saw a vision. She heard a voice saying "Little Teresa, do you wish to be cured?" She answered: "I accept all with pleasure; to live or to die, to be in good health or in bad. The good God knows well what is best for me."

"The beginning of her cure," our doctor-author points out, "coincides exactly with the day on which the Holy Father beatified the venerable Discalced Carmelite of Lisieux" (Sœur Thérèse de l'Enfant Jésus).

On May 17, when Sœur Thérèse was being canonized at Rome, Teresa Neumann arose and walked.

Unfortunately, however, the cure was not complete. Teresa

remained more or less an invalid, though she was able frequently to receive Holy Communion in the village church.

In the middle of Lent, 1926, Teresa dreamed of our Lord on the Mount of Olives, and received a wound in her left side. Wounds in the hands and bleeding from the eyes appeared on Good Friday. The parish priest, hastily summoned, declared that these wounds were of supernatural origin, the stigmata, a special mark of divine favour.

Since April, 1926, visions of the Passion and of other episodes in the life of Christ have occurred every week, beginning on Thursdays at midnight, and ending at 2 o'clock on Fridays. Teresa is unconscious of her surroundings, wholly occupied in contemplating her Saviour. Sometimes she utters words in Aramaic, sometimes she describes in German the scenes she witnesses, acting such events as she is able to reproduce. She is acquainted with the topography of Jerusalem, and can answer questions about the buildings of the city as they were in New Testament times.

Teresa Neumann has become an object of veneration, the goal of many pilgrimages, as well as an interesting case for medical investigation and discussion. She is certainly not a hypocrite. She is probably a very good girl indeed.

But if these things are true, what is their significance? Are they natural or supernatural? And, if we did not believe in God when we knew of the life and testimony of Christ, would the life of Teresa Neumann compel belief?

Let us first take the question of the stigmata. Dr. Hynek asserts that these are only granted to Catholic saints. I have come across the case of a Protestant devotee who meditated so earnestly on the Passion that marks of wounds began to appear upon his hands. Had the meditations been continued, doubtless stigmata would have been present. No supernatural gift was claimed, unless the grace of devout meditation is in itself supernatural. The line between "acquired" and "infused" contemplation is certainly hard to draw. Wounds on the body can be the result of intense thought on the part of the devotee. They are not in themselves a proof of the existence of God, or of the authority of any particular Church.

Teresa Neumann's visions are harder to explain. The simple Bavarian peasant girl had never heard Aramaic, knew nothing of Palestinian ways, architecture or geography, and had not enough historical imagination to reproduce correctly the simplest scene from our Lord's life. Whence could her visions have come? Are we to assume that events distant in time and in space are, in some mysterious manner, actually *here* and *now* to certain individuals with a power of vision?

If so, the phenomena are supernormal rather than supernatural.

Suppose, however, that we grant to Dr. Hynek the supernatural origin of Teresa's stigmata and visions, will they affect us in the manner that he believes they will? The present age is singularly unmoved by miracles. A God who maintains a moral law is more impressive in the eyes of this generation than a God who breaks a physical one.

Dr. Hynek lingers over the wonders of poor Teresa's physical state, her fasting, her unhealed wounds, her bleeding. He speaks little of her goodness.

It does not seem to Dr. Hynek incongruous that a Deity who has decked the heavens with stars, and revealed to mankind the majesty of the moral law, should, in despair at not being recognized, send symbolic torments to an obscure peasant child. Dr. Hynek's appeal is to his readers' love of the morbid, the sensational, the thaumaturgic.

We are not impressed.

Other books on Teresa Neumann, of which there seem to be a good many, may, of course, be far more edifying.

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE PSALMS: A SUGGESTED REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK VERSION AND TWELVE OLD TESTAMENT CANTICLES. Selected by John Neale Dalton, M.A., F.S.A., Canon of Windsor. Pp. xii+179. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

What are the essential features of a version of the Psalter suitable for liturgical use? The Puritans of the seventeenth century required literalness of rendering. They would have liked the "new translation" of 1611 to be substituted for that of the Prayer Book in 1661. The A.V. translation had been adopted by the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, and the abortive Prayer Book Revision of 1689 proposed to make the same concession; but in spite of the weight of opinion against it, the older version held its ground. Wheatley gives a reason for this, and at the same time indicates how he would answer the question asked above. "The reason for the continuance of which Order," he says, "is the plainness and smoothness of this translation; for the Hebraisms being not so much retain'd in this as in the late translations, the verses run much more musical and fitter for devotion." Wheatley expresses what was, and still is, the common judgment on the matter. The revival of Old Testament study last century inevitably called attention to the defects of rendering in the Prayer Book Psalter, and the Puritans' plea was advanced anew. Notwithstanding, it seems to be generally agreed that the introduction of a new or a different

translation is unthinkable, and that the defects can be remedied by a careful revision of the old.

An attempt at revision of this kind was made by a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury nearly twenty years ago. This attempt, however, was widely criticized as not being sufficiently thorough. Among the critics was the late Canon Dalton, who being eminently a practical liturgiologist, set himself to produce a version of the Psalter which should commend itself at one and the same time to a Wheatley and a Puritan. Canon Dalton's version was first published in 1920 in his *Book of Common Prayer: An Edition containing Proposals and Suggestions*. The volume before us is a reprint. Although described as a revision, the work is, in a large measure, a re-writing of the Prayer Book Psalter. In the Introduction, Canon Dalton lays down three principles by which he has been guided and which he considers essential to any version "if the Psalter is to be used with intelligence and real devotion by the ordinary worshipper." The first is that each Psalm should be prefaced by a few words indicating its character or theme. This is an undoubted advantage if the headings be brief and to the point, as Canon Dalton has made them. The headings of Psalms cv. and cvi., "The inspiration from the past" and "The warning from the past" respectively, are samples of an admirable method. The second principle is that the divisions of the Five Books should be indicated, and that the chief duplicates should be tested. The advantage of this is questionable. The Five Books do not correspond to the collections of which the Psalter is composed; they appear rather to correspond to the Five Books of the Law, and to be an arbitrary and artificial division of no importance.

The marking of the duplicates, and other cross-references, may be of interest to the student, but it will not unlikely be distracting and irritating to the worshipper. The most contentious of Canon Dalton's principles, however, is the third.

The acrostic or alphabetical form of certain Psalms, he demands, should be shown. The reason for this is that the repetition of the same idea in different words, frequently a feature of acrostic Psalms, loses its dulness and monotony if the original construction of the Psalm be clearly indicated. Canon Dalton admits the artificiality of the acrostic form. That, however, is its least defect. It inevitably involves unusual arrangements of words so that the word with the required initial letter may open the verse—*e.g.* Ps. cxi. 9, "Sent hath he redemption unto his people," and Ps. cx. 5, "Never draw back will the Lord from his oath: Priest-King for ever be thou, like as of old was Melchizedek." It may be observed also that

Canon Dalton adopts the view that Ps. cx. 1-4 is an acrostic on the name of Simon the Maccabee. The supposed acrostic is reproduced in his version, and the initial letters of the last three verses form the description "The Dread Prince." Apart from the fact that Canon Dalton is here taking a greater liberty than criticism warrants, what is "the ordinary worshipper," if he knows nothing of the history of the Maccabees, to make of the Psalm in this form? This is an acute case; but acrostic renderings in general appear to be of the number of those Hebraisms which, so Wheatley thought, were misplaced in a version primarily intended for purposes of devotion. Further, the awkward phrasing and often unpleasing diction, found not only in these Psalms but in a considerable number of others, are a serious blemish. They would even make some passages difficult to sing, whether to Plainchant or to Anglican chants. If the Psalms are to be said or sung in common, the rendering must be plain and smooth.

The verses must "run . . . musical." If they do not, they will cease to be used not only in public worship, but in private devotion as well. A new translation that ignores this fact will defeat its own purpose, however accurate it be. It may at best arouse a desire for study; it should rather kindle a longing for worship.

If Canon Dalton's Psalter is more of an essay for students than a hymn-book for worshippers, it would yet be ungenerous and misleading to conclude on this note. Throughout the work the reader will find improvements and corrections which he will wish to see incorporated in the Psalter of the Prayer Book. Not the least merit of the book is that it calls attention to the urgency of the need for Psalter revision, and by boldly risking mistakes, makes the work of future revisers easier and clearer. To many the more important section of the book is *The Canticles from the Old Testament*, twelve in number, suggested for use on certain occasions in place of Te Deum. Some perhaps will disapprove the principle of combining passages from the Apocrypha and New Testament to make up a canticle, but the one example of this amalgamation, Ecclus. xliii. 27-33, and Rom. xi. 33, 36, is successful. The adoption of such canticles as these, while it would not interfere with the structure of Morning Prayer, would give it a flexibility and variety of which at present it is too much in want. If Canon Dalton's book leads to the introduction of only a few of these canticles, he will have bestowed a genuine "enrichment" upon the Prayer Book, and laid all those who use it under a lasting debt.

E. C. RATCLIFF.

NOTICES

STUDIES IN ENGLISH PURITANISM FROM THE RESTORATION TO THE REVOLUTION, 1660-1688. By C. E. Whiting, D.D., B.C.L. S.P.C.K. 1931.

This volume is a mine of information about the various religious sects which existed in England after the time of the Commonwealth. The first section is devoted to the position of the ejected ministers who, as a result of the Act of Uniformity of 1662, found themselves without livings. There follow five chapters dealing with the doctrines and history of the Presbyterians and Independents, the Baptists, the Quakers, and the Minor Sects, about forty of which are described by Dr. Whiting at greater or less length. Some of these sects were mere religious curiosities, springing up and dying away again in the course of a few years. Others, such as the Unitarians, gained a permanent footing in English Dissent. The rest of the book deals with the theological controversies between the Church and the Dissenters, and with the organization and status of the sects, a great deal of space being of necessity given to the history of their persecution. The book is informative rather than critical or speculative; Dr. Whiting has no axe to grind. It is in the nature of an exceedingly learned handbook of facts for the historical student. It gives much food for thought as to the origins of the religious, political and intellectual ideas which brought about the extraordinary upheaval of religious life in England in the seventeenth century. As nowadays there is, in spite of appearances, a real search among English Christians for unity of faith and doctrine as the basis of a visible reunion, so in the seventeenth century the tendency seems to have been entirely centrifugal; strong religious personalities like George Fox and John Smyth (the founder of the Baptists) deeming it necessary to sweep away the claims of historic Christianity altogether, and start again on a fresh slate. Neither State nor Church, nor, with the ever-honourable exception of the Quakers, any of the Sects, could grasp the idea of Toleration, the unhappy controversies of the reign of Charles I. having identified Dissent with disloyalty and Anglicanism with subservience to the Crown and the doctrine of Divine Right.

The persecution of the Church by Parliament under the Commonwealth embittered the Anglicans, so that they could not afford to be generous when their day came. Nevertheless, as Dr. Whiting makes clear, the persecution of the Dissenters during the reign of Charles II. was preeminently a lay affair, carried out by the House of Commons, the mitigating influences being the King and in many cases individual bishops. There are instances of Dissenters being won back to the Church by the patient influence of "moderate" bishops.

MARY TREVELYAN.

REUNION AND NONCONFORMITY. W. G. Peck. Mowbray. 2s. 6d.

Mr. Peck has the best possible right to deal with the Reunion problem. He has been a Methodist minister, and is now an Anglican priest. He has broad sympathies, clear sight, a generous heart. Such qualities are

incompatible with sentimentality on the one hand and with mere partisanship on the other. The book under review is based upon four lectures given at a Clergy School last year. The author draws out the essential character of Nonconformity very clearly and candidly. He contrasts it with the Catholic standpoint as it is taken up by the Anglican Communion. He criticizes some of the suggested paths towards reunion. Finally he makes his own contribution to the solution of the problem.

The basis of Nonconformity, according to Mr. Peck, is twofold: individualism, and the sharp antithesis between Church and State. Of these the former is primary, being a general characteristic of Protestantism; the latter is specially conditioned by the historical fact that it developed at first in conscious opposition to the Church of England. The logical consequence of the former is the tendency to depreciate the importance of the Church and Sacraments, and the abandonment of Episcopacy; the actual result of the latter is that Nonconformist principles are inconsistent with the power of shaping the social structure. The practical difficulties which beset any scheme for reunion at present are three in number. There is first the Nonconformist fear of doctrines which are involved in the Anglican formularies, such as the Real Presence, Baptismal Regeneration, individual Absolution. Secondly there is the actual method of conducting services, and especially the Holy Communion service. Interchange of ceremonial between Nonconformists and even the most moderate Anglicans seems impracticable; yet without such interchange reunion would be a sham. Thirdly, the whole idea of the ministry and the sacraments is different. In the one case the conception is corporate, in the other the ministry is a matter of convenience and the sacraments functions of individual piety. In view of these difficulties it is idle to look for immediate reunion. Mr. Peck prefers to take a longer view. He wishes that both sides should prepare themselves for reunion by a deeper appreciation of the truth in each other's principles and by such a development of their own practice as may display something that the other side would wish to reunite with. Thus he desires that Anglicans should emulate the financial generosity of Nonconformists, and the importance which they attach to preaching; that they should press for the proper autonomy of the Cnurch as against the State; that they should develop the functions of the laity; that they should strive for a real integration of their doctrinal position, as contrasted with the present chaos of party views; that they should inculcate the true idea of the Episcopate. The basic Catholic position cannot be abandoned, however; and Nonconformists must recognize that the very idea of the necessity of outward union rests on Catholic assumptions. The best contribution they can make towards reunion is to stress what is really Catholic in their own outlook, to emphasize their own historic protest against the "Church and State" ideal, to school themselves in liturgical worship, and to rid themselves of the bogey of "Popery." "The Church of England is perfectly able to distinguish between Catholicism and its particular Roman version. It happens to regard this distinction as justifying its own existence."

K. D. Mackenzie.

MEDIEVAL FAITH AND FABLE. By Canon J. A. MacCulloch, D.D. Harrap. 1932. 15s.

A book like this helps us to understand the civilization and religion of the Middle Ages. It was a dawn, not a noontide period, and everything was seen in a rosy, mystical light, not accurately and rationally as by the white light of midday. The thoughts of medieval man had not completely thrown off the dreams of the childhood of Europe, and like one who, rising early, goes out into the fields at daybreak, he interprets many small things in the quaint manner of the dreamer. If, therefore, with Dr. MacCulloch, we must condemn much of medieval Catholicism as a mere survival of paganism, yet this book draws the iron from our condemnation. Dr. MacCulloch writes with sympathy as well as discretion. Perhaps, in order to appreciate the Middle Ages fairly, one must have lived, like him, in the glens of Scotland, where the spirit of the fay and the poltergeist are still vaguely felt by people of romantic temperament.

Dr. MacCulloch avers that "the old idea that the Middle Ages were the Dark Ages has been long discredited." Truly; but he provides much to prove some truth in the "old idea." Even Augustine was superstitious about the minds of women with demons. All the protests of St. Bernard could not hold in check the growing cultus of the Virgin, which arose in the Eastern Church after the fourth century, and was fostered by Damiani, and we may add by Gregory VII. in the eleventh. "Adoration was apt to take the form of erotic passion." Dr. MacCulloch's account of the prevalence of the sexual orgy among certain heretical sects may be linked up with Mr. Gerald Heard's description of the pagan orgy. The worship of the saints, which drew forth the protest of Vigilantius in the fifth century, took the place of the pagan cult of small nature deities, a cult which has come to life again today in the "elementals" of certain theosophists. Indeed, this book goes far to dispel the idea of the happiness of the Middle Ages, and the extravagancies of the Sidney Dark school, without indulging in the devastating pessimism of Dr. Coulton.

Some small *errata* require attention. Berengar was not a collector of heretical arguments as a young man—the perusal of a certain biography would have prevented this slip. We thought that Peter the Hermit was dead. The first to proclaim the Crusades was Gregory VII. Innocent III. was not Pope in 1134. Surely, even a leader of Pastoureaux never assembled a following of 100,000 people for one march! Careful readers will distinguish the heretical sectaries, the Paterines, from their namesakes at Milan, who supported the Gregorian Reforms. The latter are perhaps better known by the title "Pataria," which has a different derivation.

But here is a most readable book, packed with information on medieval customs and movements—demon raising and saint worship, relic collecting and miracle mongering, heretical propaganda and pious superstition. Not the least interesting chapter is that on the Goliards, the poor scholar-poets, who are to be distinguished from the knightly poets or Troubadours. A most readable book.

A. J. MACDONALD.

SEX, MARRIAGE AND RELIGION. By Alec R. Vidler, of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd. S.P.C.K. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 2s. 6d.

This discussion of some modern problems covers a wide range and yet is commendably brief. The author succeeds in being quite definite without being didactic. Many readers may disagree with some of the conclusions and yet derive profit without irritation from studying the book; for its appeal is largely to reason and thus should commend itself to those who are capable of thinking on this subject and are willing to do so.

The book is outspoken and does not shrink from facing up to the really modern issues. "Traditional morality," the author says, "has not resulted in a state of such universal perfection and happiness that it is impervious to revolutionary propaganda." And so he treats seriously and rationally the opponent of the Church's moral standard (or supposed standard) in sex matters. The book is bound, therefore, to disappoint those who wish to achieve the discomfiture of the antagonist solely by the bludgeon of tradition and authority.

In pages which show an accurate knowledge of the scientific side of the subject there is on p. 7 what appears to be a curious failure to appreciate one of the facts of sex. The writer says "There is no real reason why the sex and parental instincts should not be equally strong in men and women," given a use of the intelligence to modify the force of tradition and convention. But it is hard to see how at present intelligence may modify the "convention" whereby the woman's period of gestation for each child is nine months, to be followed by lactation. These tremendous physical adaptations would seem sufficient to demand a stronger parental sense in the wife than in the husband.

If, as it is to be hoped, Mr. Vidler finds time to write another book, let him put more of his footnotes into the text, where so many of them properly belong. To remove the eye to the bottom on more than half the pages in a book is distracting; it becomes annoying when the reader discovers that such a break is quite uncalled for.

The argument of this book is of wider application than to sex alone. Whether or not we accept all the conclusions, we may agree that this is the sort of line along which Christians must secure a thought-out morality.

T. W. PYM.

RELIGION, MORALS AND THE INTELLECT. By F. E. Pollard. Allen and Unwin. 5s.

Mr. H. G. Wood, in an Introductory Note, compares Mr. Pollard's book to John Morley's *On Compromise*; like that work, it comes "as a challenge and a tonic," and though our withers may not be severely wrung by the challenge, our whole constitution may well profit by the tonic. The book deals not with questions on the fringe of morality and religion, but with the root-problems in their bearing on religious and ethical opinion and practice today, and the reader has constantly to be saying, "Now what is the answer to that, and does it hold water?" It is written from a strongly intellectual point of view to enthrone Reason as the ultimate arbiter in religious matters; it attacks the "departmentalism" which makes religion and the other objects of human interest separate and distinct, it attacks authority wherever it cripples the ideals of the normally developing man, it attacks the recognition of

the mysterious element in religion, it attacks the Church for attempting to preserve "magical" ceremonies in a rationalized form, it attacks Professor A. E. Taylor's dictum that spiritual vision is as rare as mathematical or musical genius. As for sacramental symbols, does not the symbol always tend to usurp the place of the thing symbolized, and would it not be safer to commemorate the death of Christ without the bread and wine?

It is interesting to follow the path of a singularly clear and devout mind altogether unencumbered by tradition, revealing the idealist convictions, in themselves so noble, which represent religion to him; of course it comes very close to morality, a pursuit of good in which God is something always a little ahead, Jesus of Nazareth "an enduring influence" sustaining the ideals of brotherhood for which He pre-eminently stood.

Many who know that the Incarnation means something beyond this will, however, assent whole-heartedly to Mr. Pollard's defence of a rational interpretation of religion, and will welcome every philosophic and reverent effort to combat the various forms of Irrationalism which are not only making such inroads into popular religion, but also are treading the high fields of theology. It is most desirable that reason should make her claim clearly and distinctly; if it were possible to offer detailed criticism of Mr. Pollard's point of view one would endeavour, I think, not to whittle down his rationalism, but to attempt to show that a truer rationalism would incorporate much that he discards.

It should be added that the book is a model of scrupulous fairness, though the writer's own strong conviction and cultural atmosphere seem to make it impossible for him to envisage other points of view.

W. J. Ferrar.

Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology. By Edmund Husserl. Translated by W. R. Boyce Gibson. George Allen and Unwin. 16s.

Professor Gibson is to be congratulated on his patience and skill in translating this intricate and involved German philosophical work. Essentially a book for the serious student of philosophy, its reader must be prepared to consider each sentence carefully and to extract with some care the intended meaning from the involved style of expression. For this reason it is clearly impossible in such a short notice as this to give a synopsis. The book itself must be read.

The intending reader will do well to tackle first the author's preface to the English edition, which will give a clue to much that follows in the book itself. By means of the "phenomenological transformation" one abandons the standpoint of the positive sciences of nature (which include psychology) and turns to consider the transcendental ego as it exists absolutely in itself quite apart from the human ego, as *in* the posited world. Hence the fundamental distinction between phenomenology and psychology. The existence of the real world as an experience is not denied as illusory. It is an indubitable fact, but nevertheless one whose denial is not unthinkable and therefore not essential to the transcendental consciousness. In order to appreciate rightly the status of actual experience of the real world, it is first necessary to be clear as to the fundamental transcendental basis of all such contingent experience. More embracing than "experience" is "intuition," and empiricism must be extended correspondingly to seek "facts" from intuition.

The reader of this book will be interested to come across thoughts reminiscent of the historic philosophical systems. Thus the author owes much to Descartes. The "principle of all principles" that "complete clearness is the measure of all truth" is simply the Cartesian concept of "clear and distinct ideas," while the method of "bracketing" used in effecting the phenomenological reduction reminds one of the principle of doubt though used with a different end in view. More interesting to those who concern themselves with the "theory of objectivity" is the definite reference to the concept of "availability for perception." In this connection section 45 will repay careful study.

Although not a theological work, this book is well worth the attention of the serious student of Philosophical Theology, even if only for the stimulation of constructive opposition. There is a useful summary at the beginning and a very convenient analytical index at the end.

C. D. WADDAMS.

JESUS CHRIST, HIS PERSON, HIS MESSAGE AND HIS CREDENTIALS. By Léonce de Grandmaison. Volume II. Translated from the French. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

The second volume of this admirable book is quite up to the standard of the first. It is principally concerned with the message of Jesus and His Person. Such questions as the development of His Messianic Consciousness and "the Messianic secret" are concisely and judiciously dealt with. The exact meaning of the title "Son of man" is also carefully discussed. Special stress is laid on the economy of the teaching of Jesus and on the way in which the testimony of the Fourth Gospel supports that of the Synoptic Gospels on this point.

The book ends with an exceptionally interesting chapter on the solutions that have been given to the problem of the Person of Jesus arranged chronologically. The attempts made by pagans are given first and then those made by Jews and Mohammedans. Lastly the explanations given of His origin and character by the pagans of the Renaissance and the Reformers are dealt with, and those given by more recent Rationalists and Modernists.

It is noted how far modern pagan solutions are based on first-hand study of the origins of Christianity, but are taken ready-made from recent rationalistic literature. At the same time it is pointed out in how many of them Christianity is assumed to be the standard by which other religions must be judged, and how the adherents of these religions try to show how nearly their own religion approximates to it.

The origins of Western Rationalism are traced to the Averroist school of Padua and to such Italians as Campanella and Sozzini.

England was the country where these opinions chiefly flourished at first, producing Lord Herbert of Cherbury, Hobbes and the Deists.

Voltaire got many of his ideas from these men, and some questions are given from his translation of Bollingbroke's examination of the discourse of Julian the Apostate against the Christians which show at once the lack of originality in this school and its incredible ignorance of the most elementary facts of Church history, a characteristic which is still to be observed in many modern opponents of Christianity.

This school handed on the torch to Kant, and its baser elements were

worked over by Reimarus and so became the foundation of much that passes for the latest product of modern thought.

Father de Grandmaison's conclusion is that, when all the elements of the problem are taken into consideration, no better solution of the problem of Christ can be found than the definitions of the first four councils. "Change your method," he says, "and in conformity with the rule—mistaken only when it is called in to furnish a complete and self-contained philosophy—which bids us judge the tree by its fruits and the correctness of notions by the efficacy of their practical applications, and ask yourself what is the actual basis of the Christian religion, and what are the beliefs from which such boundless fruits have sprung. Try to put this clearly into abstract terms, and you find yourself back in the framework of conciliar definition."

Again, "Far from importing a systematic philosophy into the Church's faith, the notions employed by the Fathers, and the terms expressing these notions, had to be thoroughly purified or else to acquire a fresh meaning. The faith was the measure of their power of suggestion and expression; they did not modify it."

In support of this he quotes some words of Professor Bethune Baker, "No one who accepts as history in the ordinary sense of the word the implications of the Fourth Gospel (or even of all the other Gospels) as to our Lord's consciousness during His life on earth need trouble himself about any restatement of the traditional doctrine. If these are the facts of our Lord's life, and he bases his doctrine on the facts, he is not likely to arrive at a better co-ordination than the orthodox Christology offers" (*J.T.S.*, October, 1914).

The book ends with some notes on the Hymn of Rejoicing, the Confession of St. Peter, and the Last Supper.

HENRY P. V. NUNN.

JEWISH MYSTICISM AND THE LEGENDS OF BAALSHEM. By Professor Martin Buber. Translated from the German by Lucy Cohen. J. M. Dent. 6s.

Mysticism is confined to no race, and is limited to no religion. It is the product of a peculiar type of mental constitution, and the mystics of different faiths stand nearer to one another than they do to their co-religionists. It is, perhaps, only a mystic who can fully appreciate this work, but the plain man cannot fail to gather from it illumination and instruction.

Baalshem lived in the eighteenth century, and was the founder of a mystical sect of Polish Jews; his disciples are said to have numbered a million. Like all mystics, he lived in a world which the ordinary man cannot penetrate, and had to express himself in language which, we often feel, is inadequate to the full description of his experience. Yet we can see a character of rare beauty, cultivating a profoundly religious life, which helps the most materially minded among us to realize the existence of a universe beyond the reach of normal sense experience. Some of the stories told of Baalshem have a definitely Jewish application, but a large number transcend the bounds of the one religion, and the Christian preacher may find here illustrations of forms of his own message.

The translation is extremely well done. The German has been rendered into simple and beautiful English, and the reader would not suspect that another language lay behind it. On every ground, this is a book which it is a pleasure to read.

T. H. ROBINSON.

THE MESSAGE OF ISRAEL: THE CHALMERS LECTURES, 1931. By J. E. McFadyen, D.D. James Clarke. 7s. 6d.

We venture to think that this volume of essays is just what has been needed for some years past. No other book so brings the O.T. into relation to modern life and its problems. Dr. J. E. McFadyen, Professor of O.T. in Trinity College, Glasgow, is well known to teachers of Hebrew by his *Grammar* and the *Key* thereto (which is so much more than a key) and to a wide circle by such books as his *Approach to the O.T.*, etc., and his valuable series of rhythmical renderings of O.T. books (Job-Eccles, Isa., and Jer.). In a fine chapter upon "The Bible in Education," the Professor calls attention to the striking fact that here is a collection of books which contain (and without obtruding) "a consistent emphasis upon moral values. Should not our young people's education take them to such literature? For the Bible (unlike the Classics) never clothes evil with the garb of loveliness." Let the direction, however, be critical. The writer gives examples of what *not* to teach the young child, and still more of how to deal with the narratives purporting to be history which contain elements that "strain our sense of historical probability to the breaking-point." The chapter on "Reform and Reconstruction" contains a scholarly analysis and delightful application of Amos and Zechariah (these two prophets have far more in common than is generally realized). In the essay on "Prophet and Priest" the author, with considerable skill, maintains that the rendering "I desire knowledge of God *and not* sacrifice" represents the Hebrew. "And not" is not an equivalent for our "rather than." In "The World-Riddle" the writer brings out the O.T. contribution to the Problem of Suffering. Dr. McFadyen sums up the O.T. solution in the faith of the Psalmist, "If I have but thee there is nothing in heaven or earth I long for." The chapter on "Brotherhood" is most opportune. "There are millions of slaves in the world today, and tens of millions of poor people, and hundreds of millions of money spent annually in preparation for the war which we have theoretically outlawed, but whose coming nevertheless we dread" (p. 255).

It is saying hardly too much to affirm that if candidates for the sacred ministry could imbibe something of the spirit of this author their O.T. studies and their future work would be transformed. Without hesitation we commend this volume to preachers and Bible-class leaders, as well as to students of the O.T. generally.

The Message of Israel supplies an opportunity for people to understand their O.T. as it should be understood, and at the same time to see its practical and abiding value for all elements of the strange world in which today they have to live. Professor McFadyen displays his customary style of simplicity and lucidity.

A. S. CRIPPS.

SOCIAL SUBSTANCE OF RELIGION. By Gerald Heard. George Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Heard calls his book "An Essay on the Evolution of Religion." Actually it is a reading of history in terms of psychological motive, which challenges criticism both from the historian and from the psychologist, and yet which is full of insight, and well deserving of a careful reading by those who are not afraid of superficial discouragement. Mr. Heard has learned much from Freud, but he knows how to criticize him shrewdly, as when he shows the fundamental character of the food-impulses: "Sex in religion is secondary to food" (p. 106). His own philosophy is that of "Charitism," as expressed in the group, and as opposed to Catholicism, "which was the resumption of asceticism" (p. 211). This is for him a true religion, of which the essence is "the association of the individual in such groups of such size and such common aim that he loses himself, and has direct experience of the extra-individual life" (p. 94). "The one thing that matters for religion is that the group be of the right size" (p. 95). Mr. Heard has here touched a principle of very great scientific importance, even if we believe that his conception of religion is wholly insufficient. "The peremptory need for at-one-ment, the need to move with and be moved by his group" (p. 78), is indeed a radical motive in all human life.

L. W. GRENSTED.

COURAGE, TRUTH, PURITY. By R. H. Charles. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 6s.

This volume contains twenty-two sermons prepared for delivery in Westminster Abbey. They are all of a practical nature, and besides the title addresses, the late Dr. Charles deals with such subjects as Prayer, Worship, Salvation, Human Motives, and Faith and Love. Modernists are sometimes accused of minimizing the awfulness of sin, but certainly this does not apply to Dr. Charles. "Many men and women," he says, in a sermon on Purity, "come to think their own peculiar sins unescapable and inevitable. But no sins are inevitable. Religion will not have it so. The law of God is absolutely intolerant herein." The style of the sermons is direct and forceful, with strict economy in the use of words. Certain phrases stand out helpfully. In the address on "Faith and Love": "No man can lose his own presence of mind till he has first lost the consciousness of the presence of God." And in "The Soul's Cry for Salvation": "Our salvation is not complete till our entire nature is redeemed, till all our impulses, affections, purposes, and actions move in harmony with the will of God." And again in the same sermon: "Christ's religion is not an ambulance that picks up the wounded and helpless, but rather a pillar of fire leading on an armed host to victory." Certain characteristics of Dr. Charles's outlook appear from time to time throughout the book. Speaking of St. John Baptist's replies to those who asked, "What shall we do?" he says: "In no case did John make enquiries as to their orthodoxy or heterodoxy." More serious, perhaps, is his out-of-hand condemnation of asceticism, thereby ignoring the testimony of devout scholars like Baron von Hügel, as well as the experience of generations of Catholic Christians.

MARGUERITE HOWSE.

TELL JOHN: THE MESSAGE OF JESUS AND PRESENT-DAY RELIGION. By Geoffrey Allen and Roy McKay. Alexander Maclehose and Co. 5s.

Others have found the writing of a notice of this book a difficult task. Its two authors are so absolutely assured that under the inspiration of Barth and of the Group Movement they have been delivered from what they consider to be the perversions of religion in the normal thought and practice of the present-day Church; and, indeed, the "commercial traveller" element in modern Church work is so lamentably obvious, and such a vulnerable windmill to tilt at, that we welcome criticism however crude and exaggerated; the efforts of bishops hard-run themselves to keep the Church running as a going concern are often tragic; the spiritual results reached in the ruts of institutional tradition are often disappointing; and yet one can hardly imagine any parish priest of experience not discounting heavily the sweeping and somewhat heartless generalizations of Mr. Allen and Mr. McKay. Institutions may be frail vessels, but they are vessels of the Spirit.

But it is more serious that this Barthian teaching dictates a complete reversal of the typical Anglican view about the impact of the human soul on God, and the guarantee of the reality of the contact. Any idea attained by the idealist that God must be the sum and sustainer of His highest values is scouted, and God apparently reached on the Platonic path is not God at all, but a man-made and useless hypothesis. God only reveals Himself to those who are penitent for their efforts to find Him, and to justify their discovery by rational means. One can only remark how alien the thesis that God is quite "self-authenticating," and needs no support from reason, is to Catholic theology, and more especially to the normal trend of Anglican thought. It is most unlikely that *Tell John* will found a school of wide influence, but if it did—farewell to rationality!

It is perhaps the old story that strongly convinced people are nearer to truth in what they affirm than in what they deny. Let us give the writers all the credit for their account of their own religious experience, and at the same time be allowed to consider that in their negative attitude towards much that others reckon of the highest value, "the spirit of the prophets" is not always subject to the prophets.

It is unlikely that the revolt of Barth and Brunner will be a lasting force even in Lutheran Germany; and here in England more unlikely still. "We have seen three-and-twenty leaders of revolt," and in face of them all retained a placidity that has never allowed itself to be a party to the falsehood of their extremes.

W. J. FERRAR.

DIE DREI JERUSALEMREISEN DES PAULUS. M. 2.50.

PERSONEN-PROBLEME DER APOSTELGESCHICHTE. M. 1.60.

RÖMER 15. M. 1.20.

DER NICHTPAULINISCHE URSPRUNG DER PARALLELISMUS DER APOSTEL PETRUS UND PAULUS. By E. Barnikol. Walter G. Mühlau, Verlag. Kiel.

In this series of monographs Dr. Barnikol proposes new, or revives old, theories of New Testament problems. The first is typical of his methods. The visit to Jerusalem in Gal. ii. cannot be identified with that

of Acts xi. 30, or with that of Acts xv.; the differences are irreconcilable. It consequently must be identified with Acts xviii. 22. This result necessitates the conclusion that Paul and Barnabas did not go in person in Acts xi. and that their names have been added in xv. The method is clearly wrong. Why should we trouble to save the reputation of Acts xi. and xv. if in vital matters they are hopelessly mistaken? It is not inconceivable that Dr. Barnikol is right, that new evidence, if it turned up, might prove his conclusions. But the existing evidence does not, so his theory cannot be more than a guess. The second pamphlet maintains the identity of Silas with Titus, who is said to be the author of the We-sections of Acts. The thesis of the third is that Romans was not addressed to the Church of Rome. The last claims that Gal. ii. 7, 8, which strangely use Peter instead of Cephas, are interpolated verses; they seem to have been absent from Marcion's text of the Epistle.

Dr. Barnikol is too ready to find difficulties where other scholars see none. But it is a useful discipline to study his work, which is far superior to the radical scepticism of the old Dutch school or of some recent French writers, and to be reminded how little we know of the formation of the Canon. If 2 Corinthians is a book made up for Church use out of two or more letters, a tenable theory, there may have been more editing of the Pauline Canon than we generally allow for.

W. K. LOWTHER-CLARKE.

THE SERVANT OF YAHWEH. Three Lectures delivered at King's College, London, during 1926, together with the Rylands Lectures on O.T. and N.T. Subjects. By A. S. Peake, Manchester University Press. 6s.

We owe a debt to the lamented Dr. Peake's successor at Hartley College, Dr. Wardle, for editing the present volume. The "Servant" lectures now made available to the public for the first time form an extremely useful seventy-four pages. Dr. Peake reviews earlier work abroad and in this country, the claims of the various *explanations* of the Servant being concisely and fairly stated. Dr. Peake holds to the opinion which he championed first in his *Problem of Suffering*, that the Servant is Israel—"not an ideal Israel, distinct from the empirical Israel; he is the empirical Israel regarded from an ideal point of view." In the present lectures, however, he is in a position to criticize the defence which Dr. Skinner gave of his (Dr. Skinner's) view in the second edition of his commentary on Isaiah xl.-lxvi. The theory of an *ideal* Israel suffering on behalf of the actual Israel is surely utterly un-Hebraic, and in the words of Peake "the whole point of the description is that the speakers recognize that the penalties they ought to have endured have been transferred from themselves to the Servant. How, then, can we include in these penalties a calamity which had not been so transferred, but which they had felt in full measure?" Dr. Peake, with great power, argues against the "Individualist" explanation (especially on pp. 45-56). But those who take this view (as does the writer of the present notice) do not do so because the personification is not *possible*, only (in their opinion) somewhat difficult; further, the absence of the provision of atonement (under the Collectivist theory) for the actual Israel, is an argument of a general character, and not one dependent upon the security of the M.T. of Isaiah liii. 8—"for the transgressions of my people was he stricken." A reading of the lectures seems to confirm the opinion of the present reviewer

that for the future the competing claims in interpretation of the Servant passages will be narrowed down to the catch-words "the Actual Israel," *or* "Individual martyr"—the "Prophetic line," the "Godly nucleus," the "Ideal Israel" theories gradually becoming driven from the field.

It is convenient to have had other lectures of Professor Peake brought together into the present volume. *Roots of Hebrew Prophecy and Apocalyptic* (1921) illustrates Peake's balance. He refused to be carried away by the theory of E. Meyer (accepted by Gressman and others) that Hebrew prophecy was of Egyptian origin. *The Conflict of the Tyrian Baal* (nearly 50 pages) exhibits the lecturer's high standard of scholarship and not less his gift of sympathetic exposition. *The Messiah and the Son of Man* gives some most useful provision for students of the Gospels. The volume concludes with 130 pages upon St. Paul, a subject in which Dr. Peake displayed a master mind.

Throughout the volume are vast bibliographies for reference upon the subjects of the respective essays. The whole book illustrates the characteristics of this great and true man who has passed from us—amazing learning, accurate judgment, humour, humility, simplicity, and real religion.

R. S. Cripps.

John of Salisbury. By Clement C. J. Webb, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A. Methuen. 6s.

Dr. Webb's description of John of Salisbury as "the most considerable scholar and (though always 'behind the throne' rather than in a position of ostensible power) one of the most considerable figures in ecclesiastical politics that England produced during the twelfth century" is a description which he has himself done more than any one else in England, except Dr. R. L. Poole, to enable English students to appreciate. It is fortunate that the scheme of a series of "Great Medieval Churchmen," edited by Dr. Elliott Binns, and the inclusion of John in a company upon which it would have been delightful had it been possible to have his own comments, have provided an occasion for a study which will serve to make him better known. For technical discussions, Dr. Webb has been content to refer in the main to his own editions of the *Policraticus* and *Metalogicon*, and Dr. Poole's edition of the *Historia Pontificalis*, all of them published, to the great benefit of scholars, by the Clarendon Press. Here he gives an account of their subject-matter, but devotes himself chiefly to a picture of John the man of affairs, the friend of Archbishops and of Popes, the shrewd observer who kept his head and his principles when it was none too easy to do either, and could perhaps say even to Becket, "I see no one here who wishes to die for dying's sake but you." There is nothing in this to justify an imputation of counsels of timid prudence or prudent timidity, and if John lived to become "by the dignation of God and the merits of St. Thomas, the humble minister of the Church of Chartres," it was also to show that he could act with fearlessness and decision when he had himself direct responsibility. The fact that his own episcopate is the least interesting part of his life may be largely due to the circumstances of the times; it is only as a rule in a certain class of newspapers and of films that one "sensation" succeeds another with the rhythmic periodicity of a fog-horn; but he has had his part, and one, by no means a minor one, in scenes of grave significance, and cared more

for the power of influence than for public recognition of his own importance on every occasion. Readers who do not as yet know either his works or his correspondence will thank Dr. Webb for the opportunity of acquaintance with both, including the true story of the famous dubitandum about archdeacons, the one piece of mediæval history which those "venerable and egregious men"—to give them their proper designation—are never allowed by their friends to forget.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

THE DISCOVERY OF GOD. By James H. Snowden. The Macmillan Company, New York. 10s.

THE WAY IN PRAYER. Exercises in Meditation, Intercession, and Worship. By the Author of *The Way*. A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd. 2s. 6d.

When there are so many books written to tell us how to be good, why are we not better men and women? Do we not buy the books? Or, having bought them, do we fail to read them? Or, having read them, do we lay them aside without acting upon their instructions?

Here are two excellent books, clear, sane and—if we allow ourselves to be helped—very helpful.

Mr. Snowden has, besides the present work, thirty-two volumes to his credit. He has, however, compressed so much into *The Discovery of God*, that one wonders what was left over to fill thirty-two other serious books. The purpose of this book is to allow the serious doubter no shadow of an excuse for continuing to doubt. Whatever plea he urges for his unbelief, Mr. Snowden has an answer ready for him. Has he been disturbed by Science, Philosophy, Higher Criticism, experience of life or what not, the author can comfort him and set him right. Mr. Snowden is amazingly well-equipped for his task. He seems to have read everything worth reading, and to have built all his learning into the fabric of his belief. He is not only cultured, but he is widely tolerant. No superstitions disquiet him, no human folly alarms him; even the welter of freak-religions in present-day America appears to him a healthy symptom of man's undying need for God.

It is a good book, but it leaves one a little breathless. It is almost too competent, too complete, too unanswerable. However, let us be as brave as the author. He has done his share. Let us do ours. We will buy the book, read it, and—let us hope—be wholly convinced.

Simpler and more gentle is *The Way in Prayer*. Here are very quiet and very simple instructions for meditation. Read the quotations headed "Preparation," which are taken from such sources as the Gospels, Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book, one of the Homilies, the works of William Law, Ken, Andrewes, and so forth. Follow the easy "method" of reflection and thought, and call up before your mind the pictures suggested. Finally, make acts of intercession or worship to complete your devotion; not forgetting to give your meditations some practical expression during the day. A serene and lovely spirit pervades this little book. Is the author "Clement Humilis," some of whose work has already been praised in the pages of THEOLOGY?

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER.